R 8825-5.2F 8/88

# THE PUBLIC, THE SOVIETS, AND NUCLEAR ARMS

PUBLIC
SUMMIT '88

A JOINT PROJECT OF THE PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION AND
THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN POLICY DEVELOPMENT AT BROWN UNIVERSITY

A JOINT PROJECT OF
THE PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION
AND THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN
POLICY DEVELOPMENT
AT BROWN UNIVERSITY

THE PUBLIC,
THE SOVIETS,
AND NUCLEAR ARMS

# U.S. SOVIET RELATIONS IN THE YEAR 2010; AMERICANS LOOK TO THE FUTURE

## Technical Appendix

by Stephen Immerwahr

This Report Is The Result Of A Joint Project By

The Public Agenda Foundation and

The Center For Foreign Policy Development At Brown University

Public Agenda Foundation, 6 East 39th Street, New York, New York 10016 212•686•6610
Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University, Box 1948, Providence, Rhode Island 02912 401•863•3465

A JOINT PROJECT OF
THE PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION
AND THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN
POLICY DEVELOPMENT
AT BROWN UNIVERSITY

THE PUBLIC,
THE SOVIETS,
AND NUCLEAR ARMS

# U.S. SOVIET RELATIONS IN THE YEAR 2010;
# AMERICANS LOOK TO THE FUTURE

## Technical Appendix

by Stephen Immerwahr

This Report Is The Result Of A Joint Project By
The Public Agenda Foundation and
The Center For Foreign Policy Development At Brown University

Public Agenda Foundation, 6 East 39th Street, New York, New York 10016 212•686•6610
Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University, Box 1948, Providence, Rhode Island 02912 401•863•3465

Copyright 1988 by the Public Agenda Foundation

All rights reserved, including the rights to
reproduce this book or any portions thereof
in any form.

For more information contact:
The Public Agenda Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, N.Y. 10016

or

The Center for Foreign Policy Development at
Brown University
Box 1948
Providence, R.I. 02912

Public Summit '88 is a nonpartisan education and communications project designed to help Americans understand the choices that our country faces in areas of U.S.-Soviet relations and nuclear arms.

This project was co-sponsored by:
The Public Agenda Foundation
and
Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development.

## PROJECT FUNDERS

Funding for The Public, The Soviets, and Nuclear Arms
has been provided by the following institutions:

The Bohen Foundation

The Carnegie Corporation

The Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation

The George Gund Foundation

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

The Charles F. Kettering Foundation

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

The James C. Penney Foundation, Inc.

The Veatch Program

## THE PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION

The Public Agenda Foundation is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research and education organization, founded in 1975 by former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and public opinion analyst Daniel Yankelovich. Public Agenda works with media and other organizations to develop innovative ways of presenting complex issues to the public.

The Foundation has three types of programs, each designed to bring leadership, media and community groups together in a dialogue that heightens awareness about issues of national and local concern. In media-based public education campaigns, Public Agenda has worked with the media to stimulate open and constructive public debate on choices communities face on critical issues.

Each year, Public Agenda frames three topics for National Issues Forums in a set of issue books, setting down alternatives facing the American people - and their costs - and they are presented in hundreds of public gatherings where citizens can "work through" their different opinions to reach common ground.

Finally, independent research projects are undertaken to understand not only what people think about complex issues, but why they think it: these projects use a variety of research techniques renging from focused group discussions to full-scale national opinion studies.

## THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, is a nonprofit organization established in 1981 on the initiative of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Chairman Emeritus of IBM Corporation. Its mandate is to engage in research on U.S. policy for dealing with the Soviet Union and related weapons issues.

The Center brings together scholars, practitioners, and politicians and the public in a search for policy choices that can lead to consensus on the best way to reduce the risk of nuclear war while defending basic American values and interests.

The Center is separately incorporated but affiliated with Brown University and its newly-established Institute for International Studies. It is funded by grants from private individuals and foundations.

# INTRODUCTION

# Introduction

This technical appendix is a companion volume to U.S.-Soviet Relations in the Year 2010, a report by the Public Agenda Foundation and the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University describing the results of a study of public opinion conducted in January, 1988. The technical appendix has been prepared for scholars and others interested in a detailed examination of the results of a panel study with 963 Americans. The volume contains:

I. A question by question presentation of all "posttest" results showing key demographic breakdowns;

II. A presentation of results showing a comparison of those items used in both the pre- and posttests;

III. A presentation of the "pretest" results showing key demographic breakdowns;

IV. A detailed description of the research methodology used in the study, including:
   - A comparison of the panel's demographics to the demographics from national probability samples;
   - A comparison of the panel's responses on selected items to identical items from national surveys;

V. A copy of the questionnaires used in the study, and copies of the handouts given to respondents that review the chief arguments for and against each proposal.

# I. POSTTEST SUMMARY TABLES

## TABLE 1

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: SOVIETS WILL ATTACK OTHER NATIONS IN THE WAY THEY INVADED AFGHANISTAN

| The Soviet Union will attack other nations in they way they invaded Afghanistan | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 27 | 39 | 26 | 8 |
| Male | 25 | 39 | 31 | 5 |
| Female | 29 | 39 | 22 | 11 |
| White | 26 | 40 | 27 | 8 |
| Black | 26 | 38 | 30 | 6 |
| Hispanic | 40 | 44 | 13 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 17 | 44 | 27 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 27 | 42 | 26 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 33 | 37 | 25 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 32 | 35 | 30 | 4 |
| 65 and over | 28 | 39 | 25 | 9 |
| H.S. grad/less | 30 | 39 | 22 | 9 |
| Some college | 27 | 39 | 30 | 5 |
| College grad | 21 | 45 | 25 | 9 |
| Post grad | 22 | 36 | 38 | 4 |
| Democrat | 25 | 37 | 31 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 19 | 41 | 31 | 9 |
| Republican | 30 | 43 | 21 | 6 |
| Seattle | 16 | 33 | 44 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 26 | 34 | 27 | 13 |
| Chicago | 26 | 37 | 28 | 9 |
| San Antonio | 37 | 46 | 13 | 5 |
| Nashville | 31 | 45 | 20 | 5 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

# TABLE 2

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: SOONER OR LATER, THE SOVIETS WILL LAUNCH AN ALL-OUT NUCLEAR ATTACK ON THE U.S.

| Sooner or later, the Soviet Union will launch an all-out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S. | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 8 | 12 | 75 | 5 |
| Male | 6 | 7 | 84 | 3 |
| Female | 9 | 18 | 67 | 6 |
| White | 6 | 11 | 79 | 4 |
| Black | 9 | 17 | 69 | 5 |
| Hispanic | 18 | 13 | 63 | 6 |
| 18-29 | 5 | 11 | 80 | 3 |
| 30-39 | 8 | 10 | 79 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 7 | 13 | 75 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 6 | 15 | 72 | 7 |
| 65 and over | 11 | 12 | 73 | 5 |
| H.S. grad/less | 11 | 14 | 70 | 5 |
| Some college | 6 | 12 | 77 | 4 |
| College grad | 3 | 9 | 84 | 4 |
| Post grad | 3 | 6 | 87 | 3 |
| Democrat | 7 | 12 | 75 | 5 |
| Independent/other | 7 | 8 | 81 | 4 |
| Republican | 5 | 13 | 77 | 4 |
| Seattle | 5 | 7 | 84 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 8 | 15 | 73 | 4 |
| Chicago | 4 | 16 | 74 | 6 |
| San Antonio | 13 | 17 | 66 | 4 |
| Nashville | 7 | 8 | 81 | 4 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 3

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: THE ARMS RACE WILL EVENTUALLY LEAD TO NUCLEAR WAR

| The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 13 | 29 | 51 | 7 |
| Male | 13 | 26 | 54 | 7 |
| Female | 13 | 32 | 48 | 7 |
| White | 11 | 28 | 54 | 7 |
| Black | 19 | 41 | 35 | 5 |
| Hispanic | 17 | 32 | 42 | 9 |
| 18-29 | 11 | 33 | 49 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 10 | 37 | 45 | 8 |
| 40-49 | 16 | 27 | 52 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 15 | 28 | 51 | 7 |
| 65 and over | 12 | 20 | 60 | 9 |
| H.S. grad/less | 10 | 32 | 50 | 8 |
| Some college | 15 | 27 | 50 | 9 |
| College grad | 13 | 29 | 55 | 3 |
| Post grad | 12 | 27 | 56 | 5 |
| Democrat | 16 | 30 | 46 | 7 |
| Independent/other | 13 | 28 | 48 | 11 |
| Republican | 10 | 28 | 57 | 5 |
| Seattle | 14 | 29 | 51 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 17 | 32 | 47 | 5 |
| Chicago | 12 | 27 | 51 | 11 |
| San Antonio | 13 | 31 | 51 | 5 |
| Nashville | 10 | 28 | 53 | 10 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

# TABLE 4

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: WE WILL DAMAGE OUR ECONOMY BY SPENDING TOO MUCH TO DEFEND OTHER COUNTRIES

| We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 30 | 44 | 22 | 4 |
| Male | 27 | 45 | 24 | 3 |
| Female | 32 | 43 | 20 | 4 |
| White | 29 | 45 | 23 | 4 |
| Black | 34 | 47 | 13 | 5 |
| Hispanic | 31 | 39 | 29 | -- |
| 18-29 | 31 | 45 | 20 | 4 |
| 30-39 | 30 | 38 | 28 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 19 | 51 | 26 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 37 | 42 | 19 | 3 |
| 65 and over | 35 | 45 | 17 | 3 |
| H.S. grad/less | 33 | 41 | 21 | 5 |
| Some college | 30 | 46 | 22 | 3 |
| College grad | 23 | 48 | 22 | 6 |
| Post grad | 27 | 46 | 24 | 3 |
| Democrat | 34 | 44 | 18 | 4 |
| Independent/other | 27 | 51 | 19 | 3 |
| Republican | 26 | 41 | 29 | 5 |
| Seattle | 33 | 47 | 18 | 2 |
| Baltimore | 31 | 43 | 20 | 7 |
| Chicago | 32 | 46 | 19 | 4 |
| San Antonio | 27 | 42 | 27 | 4 |
| Nashville | 28 | 42 | 27 | 3 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 5

### CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: WE WILL SIGN AN ARMS AGREEMENT THAT WILL LEAVE US IN A WEAK POSITION

| We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position | Very Likely | Fairly Likely | Not that Likely | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % |
| **Total** | 9 | 20 | 65 | 7 |
| Male | 6 | 20 | 69 | 5 |
| Female | 11 | 20 | 61 | 8 |
| White | 8 | 20 | 66 | 7 |
| Black | 11 | 25 | 58 | 6 |
| Hispanic | 12 | 18 | 68 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 6 | 19 | 67 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 7 | 26 | 62 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 8 | 16 | 71 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 11 | 17 | 67 | 6 |
| 65 and over | 11 | 22 | 60 | 7 |
| H.S. grad/less | 13 | 19 | 58 | 10 |
| Some college | 6 | 23 | 68 | 3 |
| College grad | 5 | 20 | 70 | 6 |
| Post grad | 6 | 13 | 76 | 5 |
| Democrat | 9 | 16 | 69 | 6 |
| Independent/other | 6 | 16 | 73 | 4 |
| Republican | 10 | 24 | 60 | 6 |
| Seattle | 5 | 17 | 72 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 7 | 16 | 65 | 11 |
| Chicago | 11 | 21 | 61 | 7 |
| San Antonio | 12 | 25 | 61 | 3 |
| Nashville | 8 | 21 | 66 | 5 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

# TABLE 6

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: MISTRUST WILL KEEP US FROM WORKING WITH THE SOVIETS AGAINST REAL PROBLEMS, LIKE TERRORISM

| Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 32 | 42 | 22 | 5 |
| Male | 29 | 43 | 24 | 4 |
| Female | 34 | 41 | 21 | 5 |
| White | 29 | 43 | 23 | 5 |
| Black | 42 | 37 | 15 | 6 |
| Hispanic | 44 | 36 | 20 | -- |
| 18-29 | 34 | 44 | 20 | 2 |
| 30-39 | 30 | 46 | 19 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 33 | 39 | 24 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 28 | 46 | 21 | 5 |
| 65 and over | 27 | 36 | 31 | 6 |
| H.S. grad/less | 34 | 43 | 18 | 6 |
| Some college | 32 | 43 | 21 | 4 |
| College grad | 28 | 38 | 31 | 3 |
| Post grad | 27 | 41 | 27 | 5 |
| Democrat | 37 | 41 | 18 | 4 |
| Independent/other | 25 | 43 | 27 | 5 |
| Republican | 27 | 44 | 24 | 5 |
| Seattle | 23 | 37 | 33 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 36 | 43 | 14 | 6 |
| Chicago | 40 | 39 | 17 | 4 |
| San Antonio | 34 | 44 | 21 | 1 |
| Nashville | 24 | 46 | 25 | 5 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 7

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: A REGIONAL WAR (LIKE IN THE MIDDLE EAST) WILL ESCALATE INTO ALL-OUT WAR

| A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into an all-out war | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 14 | 39 | 38 | 8 |
| Male | 12 | 39 | 44 | 5 |
| Female | 17 | 40 | 33 | 11 |
| White | 13 | 40 | 39 | 8 |
| Black | 16 | 43 | 31 | 11 |
| Hispanic | 17 | 37 | 42 | 5 |
| 18-29 | 14 | 41 | 36 | 9 |
| 30-39 | 14 | 43 | 36 | 7 |
| 40-49 | 17 | 38 | 40 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 13 | 39 | 38 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 9 | 39 | 44 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 14 | 38 | 36 | 12 |
| Some college | 15 | 40 | 40 | 6 |
| College grad | 13 | 47 | 37 | 3 |
| Post grad | 10 | 38 | 46 | 6 |
| Democrat | 15 | 37 | 38 | 10 |
| Independent/other | 9 | 39 | 46 | 7 |
| Republican | 14 | 43 | 37 | 6 |
| Seattle | 10 | 44 | 38 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 20 | 40 | 33 | 7 |
| Chicago | 14 | 37 | 40 | 9 |
| San Antonio | 15 | 40 | 37 | 9 |
| Nashville | 13 | 35 | 44 | 8 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

# TABLE 8

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: THE U.S WILL ACT AS 'WORLD POLICEMAN AND GET INTO ANOTHER VIETNAM

| The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 13 | 35 | 43 | 9 |
| Male | 13 | 35 | 45 | 7 |
| Female | 14 | 36 | 41 | 10 |
| White | 12 | 35 | 46 | 7 |
| Black | 12 | 45 | 25 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 26 | 32 | 36 | 6 |
| 18-29 | 11 | 44 | 38 | 8 |
| 30-39 | 17 | 37 | 40 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 17 | 35 | 42 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 31 | 46 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 11 | 28 | 55 | 6 |
| H.S. grad/less | 16 | 32 | 41 | 11 |
| Some college | 11 | 38 | 45 | 5 |
| College grad | 12 | 39 | 41 | 9 |
| Post grad | 11 | 38 | 43 | 8 |
| Democrat | 16 | 37 | 38 | 9 |
| Independent/other | 16 | 32 | 45 | 8 |
| Republican | 10 | 35 | 49 | 6 |
| Seattle | 12 | 37 | 45 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 15 | 35 | 39 | 11 |
| Chicago | 15 | 35 | 42 | [illegible] |
| San Antonio | 14 | 36 | 42 | 8 |
| Nashville | 11 | 35 | 46 | 9 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 9

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: MARXISM/COMMUNISM WILL SPREAD TO MORE AND MORE COUNTRIES AROUND THE WORLD

| Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 16 | 39 | 33 | 12 |
| Male | 16 | 41 | 33 | 10 |
| Female | 16 | 36 | 33 | 14 |
| White | 15 | 40 | 32 | 13 |
| Black | 14 | 34 | 42 | 10 |
| Hispanic | 24 | 35 | 36 | 5 |
| 18-29 | 13 | 36 | 38 | 14 |
| 30-39 | 15 | 37 | 38 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 12 | 45 | 33 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 21 | 41 | 24 | 14 |
| 65 and over | 19 | 41 | 30 | 10 |
| H.S. grad/less | 18 | 39 | 30 | 13 |
| Some college | 14 | 40 | 34 | 12 |
| College grad | 16 | 37 | 39 | 9 |
| Post grad | 14 | 45 | 29 | 13 |
| Democrat | 13 | 37 | 38 | 12 |
| Independent/other | 10 | 46 | 30 | 13 |
| Republican | 21 | 41 | 29 | 10 |
| Seattle | 11 | 37 | 38 | 15 |
| Baltimore | 14 | 35 | 36 | 15 |
| Chicago | 18 | 37 | 36 | 8 |
| San Antonio | 21 | 44 | 25 | 10 |
| Nashville | 16 | 42 | 31 | 12 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 10

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: SOVIETS WILL INCREASE THEIR SUPPORT OF LYBIA AND OTHER TERRORISTS

| The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Lybia and terrorist groups in the Middle East | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 22 | 47 | 22 | 9 |
| Male | 20 | 48 | 27 | 6 |
| Female | 24 | 47 | 17 | 13 |
| White | 21 | 48 | 22 | 8 |
| Black | 23 | 42 | 24 | 11 |
| Hispanic | 25 | 50 | 16 | 8 |
| 18-29 | 14 | 48 | 25 | 13 |
| 30-39 | 24 | 43 | 24 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 25 | 50 | 19 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 23 | 49 | 19 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 24 | 48 | 24 | 4 |
| H.S. grad/less | 23 | 49 | 19 | 9 |
| Some college | 21 | 48 | 23 | 8 |
| College grad | 20 | 46 | 26 | 8 |
| Post grad | 18 | 44 | 28 | 10 |
| Democrat | 18 | 48 | 24 | 10 |
| Independent/other | 16 | 47 | 28 | 10 |
| Republican | 28 | 47 | 18 | 8 |
| Seattle | 13 | 42 | 34 | 11 |
| Baltimore | 18 | 49 | 21 | 12 |
| Chicago | 21 | 47 | 22 | 9 |
| San Antonio | 29 | 51 | 13 | 7 |
| Nashville | 27 | 45 | 21 | 7 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 11

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: A SMALLER COUNTRY (LIKE PAKISTAN OR ISRAEL) WILL EVENTUALLY USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

| A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 18 | 43 | 31 | 9 |
| Male | 19 | 44 | 30 | 7 |
| Female | 16 | 41 | 32 | 10 |
| White | 17 | 42 | 32 | 9 |
| Black | 17 | 50 | 25 | 8 |
| Hispanic | 13 | 44 | 39 | 4 |
| 18-29 | 17 | 50 | 25 | 8 |
| 30-39 | 17 | 43 | 30 | 10 |
| 40-49 | 18 | 39 | 35 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 43 | 29 | 11 |
| 65 and over | 17 | 38 | 39 | 5 |
| H.S. grad/less | 18 | 39 | 34 | 9 |
| Some college | 15 | 46 | 32 | 8 |
| College grad | 22 | 49 | 23 | 6 |
| Post grad | 15 | 39 | 35 | 12 |
| Democrat | 18 | 43 | 31 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 15 | 49 | 26 | 10 |
| Republican | 18 | 42 | 32 | 8 |
| Seattle | 13 | 45 | 33 | 9 |
| Baltimore | 21 | 39 | 31 | 9 |
| Chicago | 18 | 42 | 30 | 11 |
| San Antonio | 15 | 46 | 31 | 8 |
| Nashville | 22 | 42 | 30 | 6 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 12

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: POOR COMMUNICATION WILL CAUSE A CONFLICT OR INCIDENT TO BECOME A CRISIS THAT THREATENS WAR

| Poor communication will cause a conflict or incident (like the downing of the Korean airliner) to become a crisis that threatens war | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 18 | 45 | 30 | 6 |
| Male | 18 | 43 | 36 | 4 |
| Female | 19 | 48 | 25 | 8 |
| White | 16 | 46 | 32 | 6 |
| Black | 22 | 49 | 19 | 10 |
| Hispanic | 30 | 43 | 25 | 2 |
| 18-29 | 17 | 54 | 24 | 5 |
| 30-39 | 22 | 41 | 34 | 3 |
| 40-49 | 18 | 45 | 30 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 20 | 44 | 27 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 14 | 43 | 40 | 4 |
| H.S. grad/less | 17 | 47 | 28 | 8 |
| Some college | 20 | 43 | 33 | 4 |
| College grad | 16 | 50 | 30 | 4 |
| Post grad | 20 | 47 | 27 | 6 |
| Democrat | 20 | 45 | 28 | 7 |
| Independent/other | 20 | 47 | 30 | 3 |
| Republican | 15 | 47 | 32 | 6 |
| Seattle | 14 | 47 | 36 | 3 |
| Baltimore | 20 | 43 | 31 | 6 |
| Chicago | 20 | 47 | 25 | 7 |
| San Antonio | 21 | 41 | 32 | 6 |
| Nashville | 17 | 49 | 26 | 8 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 13

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: WE WILL NEGLECT PROBLEMS HERE BECAUSE WE SPEND SO MUCH ON THE ARMS RACE

| We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 29 | 43 | 25 | 3 |
| Male | 25 | 45 | 27 | 3 |
| Female | 32 | 42 | 22 | 3 |
| White | 25 | 45 | 26 | 3 |
| Black | 41 | 47 | 11 | 2 |
| Hispanic | 35 | 41 | 21 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 30 | 43 | 24 | 3 |
| 30-39 | 33 | 41 | 24 | 2 |
| 40-49 | 24 | 45 | 29 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 52 | 19 | 2 |
| 65 and over | 28 | 40 | 27 | 5 |
| H.S. grad/less | 31 | 42 | 24 | 3 |
| Some college | 29 | 43 | 25 | 3 |
| College grad | 21 | 51 | 25 | 3 |
| Post grad | 28 | 50 | 19 | 3 |
| Democrat | 36 | 46 | 15 | 3 |
| Independent/other | 28 | 52 | 20 | -- |
| Republican | 20 | 40 | 37 | 3 |
| Seattle | 34 | 41 | 21 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 32 | 42 | 24 | 2 |
| Chicago | 30 | 42 | 26 | 2 |
| San Antonio | 26 | 45 | 27 | 2 |
| Nashville | 23 | 47 | 26 | 4 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 14

## CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: NUCLEAR WEAPON WILL BE LAUNCHED ACCIDENTALLY

| A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by a computer | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 8 | 18 | 64 | 10 |
| Male | 7 | 17 | 69 | 8 |
| Female | 10 | 18 | 60 | 12 |
| White | 7 | 16 | 68 | 9 |
| Black | 9 | 29 | 44 | 19 |
| Hispanic | 15 | 18 | 57 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 8 | 18 | 63 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 8 | 20 | 65 | 8 |
| 40-49 | 9 | 14 | 70 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 14 | 69 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 7 | 23 | 56 | 14 |
| H.S. grad/less | 10 | 20 | 56 | 14 |
| Some college | 8 | 15 | 69 | 9 |
| College grad | 4 | 18 | 72 | 6 |
| Post grad | 4 | 16 | 77 | 3 |
| Democrat | 8 | 19 | 62 | 12 |
| Independent/other | 7 | 20 | 64 | 9 |
| Republican | 8 | 15 | 70 | 8 |
| Seattle | 3 | 20 | 66 | 10 |
| Baltimore | 13 | 18 | 61 | 8 |
| Chicago | 8 | 16 | 60 | 16 |
| San Antonio | 10 | 19 | 64 | 7 |
| Nashville | 6 | 14 | 70 | 10 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 15

## AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIETS WANT TO WORK WITH US TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS, SUCH AS THE ENVIRONMENT

| The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 55 | 24 | 21 |
| Male | 61 | 20 | 19 |
| Female | 50 | 28 | 22 |
| White | 57 | 22 | 21 |
| Black | 48 | 35 | 18 |
| Hispanic | 49 | 28 | 23 |
| 18-29 | 62 | 21 | 17 |
| 30-39 | 59 | 25 | 16 |
| 40-49 | 56 | 27 | 17 |
| 50-64 | 42 | 23 | 34 |
| 65 and over | 56 | 24 | 20 |
| H.S. grad/less | 47 | 29 | 25 |
| Some college | 60 | 22 | 18 |
| College grad | 65 | 17 | 18 |
| Post grad | 61 | 21 | 18 |
| Democrat | 57 | 23 | 21 |
| Independent/other | 58 | 23 | 19 |
| Republican | 52 | 27 | 21 |
| Seattle | 73 | 11 | 15 |
| Baltimore | 53 | 27 | 20 |
| Chicago | 49 | 24 | 28 |
| San Antonio | 49 | 30 | 22 |
| Nashville | 51 | 29 | 20 |

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

# TABLE 16

## AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIETS WANT TO REDUCE THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR AS BADLY AS WE DO

| Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 82 | 9 | 9 |
| | | | |
| Male | 85 | 8 | 8 |
| Female | 80 | 10 | 9 |
| | | | |
| White | 84 | 8 | 8 |
| Black | 74 | 15 | 10 |
| Hispanic | 75 | 11 | 14 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 84 | 8 | 9 |
| 30-39 | 82 | 7 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 83 | 9 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 78 | 12 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 88 | 9 | 3 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 76 | 12 | 11 |
| Some college | 84 | 7 | 9 |
| College grad | 89 | 5 | 7 |
| Post grad | 91 | 8 | 1 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 85 | 7 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 85 | 7 | 8 |
| Republican | 81 | 11 | 9 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 91 | 4 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 79 | 12 | 9 |
| Chicago | 79 | 9 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 78 | 13 | 10 |
| Nashville | 85 | 7 | 8 |

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 17

## AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: NO MATTER WHAT THEY SAY, THE SOVIETS REALLY WANT THE WORLD TO BE COMMUNIST AND WON'T STOP TRYING

| No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 53 | 27 | 21 |
| Male | 54 | 28 | 18 |
| Female | 51 | 26 | 23 |
| White | 52 | 28 | 20 |
| Black | 47 | 29 | 24 |
| Hispanic | 63 | 15 | 21 |
| 18-29 | 41 | 40 | 19 |
| 30-39 | 51 | 31 | 18 |
| 40-49 | 58 | 22 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 57 | 19 | 24 |
| 65 and over | 60 | 20 | 20 |
| H.S. grad/less | 52 | 24 | 24 |
| Some college | 55 | 28 | 17 |
| College grad | 48 | 32 | 20 |
| Post grad | 48 | 30 | 22 |
| Democrat | 46 | 32 | 22 |
| Independent/other | 45 | 31 | 25 |
| Republican | 63 | 20 | 16 |
| Seattle | 39 | 41 | 20 |
| Baltimore | 48 | 27 | 26 |
| Chicago | 53 | 29 | 18 |
| San Antonio | 65 | 17 | 19 |
| Nashville | 59 | 22 | 19 |

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

# TABLE 18

## AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIETS HAVE SO MANY PROBLEMS OF THEIR OWN THEY DON'T POSE MUCH OF A THREAT TO THE U.S.

| The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S. | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 17 | 72 | 12 |
| Male | 20 | 69 | 11 |
| Female | 13 | 74 | 13 |
| White | 17 | 71 | 12 |
| Black | 13 | 78 | 9 |
| Hispanic | 15 | 75 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 14 | 71 | 15 |
| 30-39 | 13 | 81 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 15 | 78 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 18 | 70 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 24 | 59 | 17 |
| H.S. grad/less | 16 | 71 | 14 |
| Some college | 16 | 74 | 10 |
| College grad | 20 | 72 | 8 |
| Post grad | 18 | 70 | 13 |
| Democrat | 18 | 70 | 12 |
| Independent/other | 19 | 69 | 11 |
| Republican | 14 | 76 | 11 |
| Seattle | 28 | 60 | 12 |
| Baltimore | 17 | 69 | 14 |
| Chicago | 12 | 73 | 15 |
| San Antonio | 12 | 80 | 8 |
| Nashville | 12 | 77 | 11 |

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 19

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BUILD STAR WARS, EVEN IF WE HAVE TO GIVE UP NUCLEAR ARMS NEGOTIATIONS

| We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called Star Wars or SDI) even if that means giving up the chance to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear arms with the Soviets | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 26 | 30 | 20 | 19 | 6 |
| Male | 32 | 29 | 20 | 16 | 3 |
| Female | 20 | 31 | 20 | 22 | 8 |
| White | 26 | 30 | 19 | 21 | 5 |
| Black | 18 | 35 | 29 | 13 | 5 |
| Hispanics | 33 | 34 | 25 | 6 | 2 |
| 18-29 | 24 | 30 | 23 | 17 | 6 |
| 30-39 | 29 | 25 | 23 | 23 | 1 |
| 40-49 | 23 | 29 | 19 | 25 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 31 | 23 | 13 | 7 |
| 65 and over | 28 | 39 | 10 | 18 | 6 |
| H.S. grad/less | 29 | 36 | 17 | 12 | 6 |
| Some college | 26 | 27 | 18 | 23 | 6 |
| College grad | 21 | 27 | 28 | 21 | 3 |
| Post grad | 19 | 29 | 26 | 26 | -- |
| Democrat | 20 | 26 | 23 | 24 | 7 |
| Independent/other | 17 | 36 | 18 | 25 | 5 |
| Republican | 36 | 32 | 17 | 11 | 4 |
| Seattle | 15 | 22 | 18 | 41 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 23 | 29 | 21 | 19 | 9 |
| Chicago | 23 | 32 | 25 | 15 | 6 |
| San Antonio | 38 | 33 | 20 | 6 | 3 |
| Nashville | 31 | 34 | 15 | 15 | 6 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 20

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: AID ANTI-COMMUNIST GROUPS, EVEN IF THEY DON'T BELIEVE IN DEMOCRACY

| We should aid anti-communist groups and governments in the Third World even if that means sometimes supporting dictators and others who do not believe in democracy | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 10 | 29 | 28 | 25 | 8 |
| Male | 13 | 32 | 27 | 23 | 5 |
| Female | 8 | 25 | 29 | 27 | 11 |
| White | 10 | 29 | 28 | 25 | 8 |
| Black | 10 | 25 | 30 | 27 | 8 |
| Hispanics | 18 | 30 | 32 | 17 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 7 | 30 | 28 | 26 | 9 |
| 30-39 | 11 | 30 | 29 | 21 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 7 | 32 | 29 | 27 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 27 | 28 | 27 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 17 | 26 | 28 | 23 | 6 |
| H.S. grad/less | 8 | 29 | 27 | 24 | 12 |
| Some college | 12 | 31 | 29 | 24 | 5 |
| College grad | 13 | 26 | 30 | 29 | 2 |
| Post grad | 9 | 29 | 26 | 25 | 10 |
| Democrat | 6 | 26 | 30 | 31 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 10 | 30 | 23 | 30 | 8 |
| Republican | 17 | 33 | 28 | 16 | 6 |
| Seattle | 7 | 19 | 30 | 39 | 4 |
| Baltimore | 6 | 25 | 30 | 28 | 11 |
| Chicago | 10 | 30 | 27 | 22 | 10 |
| San Antonio | 16 | 35 | 26 | 15 | 7 |
| Nashville | 11 | 34 | 26 | 20 | 9 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 21

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: WORK WITH SOVIETS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS FACING US BOTH

| We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries, even if the only way to gain their trust is sharing or not building SDI or Star Wars | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 28 | 31 | 19 | 17 | 6 |
| Male | 27 | 31 | 19 | 19 | 4 |
| Female | 29 | 30 | 18 | 16 | 7 |
| White | 29 | 30 | 18 | 17 | 6 |
| Black | 24 | 41 | 19 | 13 | 4 |
| Hispanics | 22 | 32 | 22 | 21 | 2 |
| 18-29 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 15 | 6 |
| 30-39 | 27 | 36 | 17 | 16 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 32 | 31 | 12 | 21 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 24 | 31 | 23 | 18 | 5 |
| 65 and over | 29 | 25 | 21 | 19 | 5 |
| H.S. grad/less | 24 | 31 | 19 | 18 | 7 |
| Some college | 30 | 31 | 18 | 16 | 5 |
| College grad | 28 | 32 | 16 | 21 | 2 |
| Post grad | 34 | 26 | 21 | 14 | 5 |
| Democrat | 33 | 34 | 15 | 14 | 5 |
| Independent/other | 35 | 28 | 23 | 12 | 3 |
| Republican | 21 | 28 | 20 | 24 | 7 |
| Seattle | 42 | 27 | 12 | 14 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 29 | 38 | 14 | 14 | 5 |
| Chicago | 29 | 28 | 19 | 18 | 6 |
| San Antonio | 16 | 27 | 32 | 22 | 4 |
| Nashville | 25 | 32 | 17 | 18 | 8 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 22

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BRING HOME TROOPS AND END TREATY COMMITMENTS, EVEN IF OUR ALLIES MIGHT MAKE CONCESSIONS TO THE SOVIETS

| We should bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments, even if that means our allies might make concessions to the Soviets | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 7 | 13 | 28 | 49 | 4 |
| Male | 8 | 12 | 26 | 51 | 3 |
| Female | 6 | 15 | 29 | 47 | 4 |
| White | 6 | 13 | 28 | 50 | 3 |
| Black | 8 | 18 | 33 | 36 | 5 |
| Hispanics | 12 | 8 | 18 | 59 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 7 | 13 | 28 | 49 | 4 |
| 30-39 | 5 | 12 | 28 | 52 | 2 |
| 40-49 | 4 | 13 | 25 | 55 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 12 | 29 | 48 | 5 |
| 65 and over | 13 | 18 | 26 | 40 | 3 |
| H.S. grad/less | 9 | 14 | 30 | 41 | 6 |
| Some college | 6 | 12 | 26 | 53 | 3 |
| College grad | 4 | 12 | 25 | 57 | 2 |
| Post grad | 7 | 14 | 25 | 54 | -- |
| Democrat | 8 | 15 | 30 | 43 | 4 |
| Independent/other | 8 | 15 | 35 | 38 | 4 |
| Republican | 4 | 11 | 22 | 61 | 2 |
| Seattle | 10 | 19 | 25 | 42 | 3 |
| Baltimore | 6 | 14 | 38 | 39 | 3 |
| Chicago | 7 | 11 | 23 | 55 | 4 |
| San Antonio | 6 | 9 | 25 | 57 | 4 |
| Nashville | 6 | 13 | 27 | 50 | 4 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 23

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: RECOGNIZE AND ESTABLISH TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA, EVEN IF THAT MEANS STRENGTHENING A COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT

| We should recognize Cuba and establish trade relations, even if that means strengthening and legitimizing a communist government in this hemisphere | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 10 | 26 | 22 | 32 | 10 |
| Male | 12 | 30 | 22 | 30 | 6 |
| Female | 9 | 22 | 23 | 34 | 13 |
| White | 10 | 27 | 21 | 33 | 10 |
| Black | 11 | 32 | 32 | 17 | 9 |
| Hispanics | 10 | 15 | 28 | 43 | 5 |
| 18-29 | 9 | 29 | 22 | 28 | 12 |
| 30-39 | 11 | 29 | 19 | 33 | 10 |
| 40-49 | 7 | 28 | 24 | 35 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 20 | 26 | 34 | 8 |
| 65 and over | 15 | 25 | 19 | 32 | 9 |
| H.S. grad/less | 9 | 21 | 25 | 34 | 12 |
| Some college | 11 | 27 | 21 | 32 | 11 |
| College grad | 10 | 35 | 23 | 29 | 3 |
| Post grad | 15 | 33 | 14 | 32 | 5 |
| Democrat | 13 | 27 | 23 | 27 | 10 |
| Independent/other | 15 | 33 | 21 | 20 | 11 |
| Republican | 5 | 24 | 21 | 43 | 7 |
| Seattle | 25 | 32 | 15 | 18 | 10 |
| Baltimore | 8 | 28 | 25 | 31 | 9 |
| Chicago | 8 | 22 | 24 | 34 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 3 | 19 | 27 | 44 | 8 |
| Nashville | 7 | 30 | 21 | 32 | 10 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 24

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: AGREE TO CUT BOTH SIDES' MILITARY ARSENALS EVEN IF THAT MEANS THEY WOULD HAVE THE LARGEST ARMY IN THE WORLD

| We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically, even if that means leaving them with the largest army in the world | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 17 | 30 | 19 | 28 | 6 |
| | | | | | |
| Male | 22 | 35 | 17 | 22 | 4 |
| Female | 13 | 24 | 21 | 34 | 8 |
| | | | | | |
| White | 18 | 30 | 19 | 27 | 6 |
| Black | 10 | 23 | 29 | 34 | 3 |
| Hispanics | 19 | 24 | 18 | 35 | 5 |
| | | | | | |
| 18-29 | 15 | 33 | 20 | 25 | 8 |
| 30-39 | 18 | 34 | 18 | 28 | 2 |
| 40-49 | 15 | 27 | 22 | 30 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 13 | 24 | 23 | 34 | 7 |
| 65 and over | 25 | 31 | 16 | 25 | 3 |
| | | | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 14 | 24 | 19 | 33 | 9 |
| Some college | 20 | 31 | 20 | 25 | 4 |
| College grad | 17 | 34 | 21 | 27 | 2 |
| Post grad | 17 | 37 | 17 | 25 | 4 |
| | | | | | |
| Democrat | 18 | 29 | 19 | 29 | 5 |
| Independent/other | 19 | 33 | 17 | 24 | 7 |
| Republican | 15 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 5 |
| | | | | | |
| Seattle | 28 | 34 | 18 | 16 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 13 | 30 | 17 | 35 | 5 |
| Chicago | 20 | 28 | 21 | 26 | 6 |
| San Antonio | 13 | 25 | 22 | 33 | 7 |
| Nashville | 12 | 31 | 19 | 32 | 7 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 25

### REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: DON'T WORK WITH SOVIETS UNTIL THEY SHOW RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, EVEN IF THAT MEANS NO ARMS AGREEMENTS

| We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights, even if that means not signing any arms control agreements | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 12 | 24 | 35 | 23 | 5 |
| Male | 11 | 25 | 39 | 22 | 3 |
| Female | 13 | 24 | 32 | 25 | 6 |
| White | 10 | 25 | 37 | 24 | 4 |
| Black | 13 | 23 | 34 | 23 | 8 |
| Hispanics | 26 | 27 | 27 | 15 | 5 |
| 18-29 | 9 | 29 | 34 | 22 | 5 |
| 30-39 | 12 | 27 | 32 | 25 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 9 | 23 | 42 | 23 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 20 | 37 | 26 | 1 |
| 65 and over | 17 | 24 | 33 | 23 | 4 |
| H.S. grad/less | 15 | 26 | 33 | 20 | 5 |
| Some college | 11 | 24 | 38 | 23 | 4 |
| College grad | 7 | 23 | 38 | 30 | 3 |
| Post grad | 10 | 22 | 35 | 31 | 1 |
| Democrat | 11 | 25 | 34 | 26 | 4 |
| Independent/other | 12 | 24 | 34 | 28 | 2 |
| Republican | 13 | 26 | 38 | 20 | 4 |
| Seattle | 8 | 18 | 34 | 37 | 4 |
| Baltimore | 13 | 24 | 33 | 23 | 7 |
| Chicago | 12 | 25 | 35 | 23 | 6 |
| San Antonio | 16 | 25 | 45 | 12 | 3 |
| Nashville | 13 | 30 | 31 | 22 | 4 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 26

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: PROVIDE INCREASED AID TO THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES, EVEN IF IT INCREASES THE CHANCE OF U.S. TROOPS GETTING INVOLVED

| We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries, even if that means increasing the chance that U.S. troops will get involved in local fighting | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 13 | 31 | 30 | 21 | 6 |
| Male | 16 | 31 | 29 | 21 | 3 |
| Female | 10 | 30 | 30 | 21 | 9 |
| White | 11 | 31 | 30 | 22 | 6 |
| Black | 14 | 31 | 32 | 20 | 4 |
| Hispanics | 27 | 27 | 25 | 15 | 5 |
| 18-29 | 11 | 29 | 32 | 21 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 14 | 36 | 29 | 18 | 3 |
| 40-49 | 10 | 36 | 31 | 19 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 28 | 27 | 29 | 5 |
| 65 and over | 17 | 21 | 32 | 20 | 11 |
| H.S. grad/less | 15 | 27 | 30 | 20 | 8 |
| Some college | 13 | 28 | 35 | 19 | 5 |
| College grad | 7 | 36 | 26 | 27 | 4 |
| Post grad | 9 | 41 | 19 | 27 | 5 |
| Democrat | 11 | 25 | 32 | 26 | 6 |
| Independent/other | 8 | 24 | 32 | 29 | 7 |
| Republican | 16 | 38 | 28 | 14 | 5 |
| Seattle | 6 | 21 | 30 | 38 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 13 | 27 | 32 | 22 | 7 |
| Chicago | 12 | 31 | 28 | 23 | 6 |
| San Antonio | 19 | 34 | 33 | 9 | 5 |
| Nashville | 13 | 39 | 26 | 15 | 8 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

# TABLE 27

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: WORK WITH SOVIETS ON MANNED MISSION TO THE PLANET MARS, EVEN IF IT MEANS SHARING TECHNOLOGY

| We and the Soviets should work together on a joint manned mission to the planet Mars, even if that means sharing our high technology | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 21 | 29 | 21 | 22 | 7 |
| Male | 27 | 29 | 20 | 19 | 6 |
| Female | 15 | 30 | 22 | 25 | 9 |
| White | 22 | 29 | 20 | 21 | 7 |
| Black | 14 | 39 | 23 | 20 | 4 |
| Hispanics | 16 | 31 | 19 | 29 | 4 |
| 18-29 | 18 | 29 | 20 | 24 | 9 |
| 30-39 | 18 | 32 | 19 | 25 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 21 | 29 | 20 | 22 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 23 | 28 | 19 | 23 | 7 |
| 65 and over | 26 | 29 | 26 | 15 | 4 |
| H.S. grad/less | 17 | 21 | 30 | 25 | 8 |
| Some college | 24 | 34 | 16 | 20 | 6 |
| College grad | 22 | 36 | 15 | 22 | 6 |
| Post grad | 24 | 41 | 13 | 16 | 7 |
| Democrat | 23 | 32 | 22 | 19 | 5 |
| Independent/other | 30 | 25 | 23 | 13 | 9 |
| Republican | 16 | 30 | 19 | 28 | 8 |
| Seattle | 34 | 36 | 11 | 15 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 18 | 37 | 21 | 17 | 8 |
| Chicago | 23 | 21 | 20 | 24 | 11 |
| San Antonio | 14 | 26 | 26 | 30 | 5 |
| Nashville | 17 | 27 | 26 | 23 | 7 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 28

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: MAKE ALLIES PAY MORE OF THE COST OF THEIR DEFENSE, EVEN IF WE LOSE SOME CONTROL OVER ECONOMIC ISSUES

| We should make our allies (like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense, even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 37 | 41 | 11 | 4 | 7 |
| Male | 43 | 42 | 9 | 3 | 3 |
| Female | 32 | 41 | 13 | 4 | 10 |
| White | 38 | 42 | 12 | 2 | 6 |
| Black | 26 | 42 | 13 | 7 | 12 |
| Hispanics | 31 | 49 | 9 | 9 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 26 | 44 | 16 | 5 | 9 |
| 30-39 | 38 | 41 | 13 | 2 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 37 | 45 | 10 | 2 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 40 | 42 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| 65 and over | 51 | 35 | 10 | 1 | 4 |
| H.S. grad/less | 31 | 41 | 13 | 5 | 10 |
| Some college | 38 | 41 | 12 | 3 | 5 |
| College grad | 37 | 49 | 9 | 1 | 5 |
| Post grad | 52 | 40 | 5 | -- | 4 |
| Democrat | 34 | 42 | 13 | 5 | 6 |
| Independent/other | 34 | 42 | 12 | 4 | 9 |
| Republican | 42 | 42 | 9 | 1 | 5 |
| Seattle | 39 | 48 | 7 | 1 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 40 | 35 | 11 | 4 | 10 |
| Chicago | 37 | 36 | 14 | 6 | 7 |
| San Antonio | 36 | 44 | 11 | 3 | 5 |
| Nashville | 34 | 41 | 13 | 4 | 7 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 29

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: NEGOTIATE AGREEMENTS WITH SOVIETS TO PREVENT REGIONAL CRISES FROM ESCALATING, EVEN IF ALLIES OPPOSE THEM

| We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war, even if that means doing things that our allies such as Israel oppose | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 28 | 42 | 13 | 7 | 11 |
| Male | 35 | 42 | 10 | 6 | 7 |
| Female | 22 | 41 | 16 | 8 | 14 |
| White | 29 | 43 | 12 | 6 | 10 |
| Black | 19 | 45 | 15 | 8 | 12 |
| Hispanics | 21 | 32 | 25 | 17 | 5 |
| 18-29 | 22 | 45 | 13 | 5 | 16 |
| 30-39 | 24 | 45 | 15 | 8 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 24 | 47 | 13 | 8 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 35 | 37 | 11 | 7 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 42 | 34 | 15 | 7 | 3 |
| H.S. grad/less | 20 | 42 | 15 | 10 | 14 |
| Some college | 33 | 40 | 15 | 6 | 8 |
| College grad | 32 | 44 | 9 | 6 | 10 |
| Post grad | 36 | 52 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| Democrat | 28 | 41 | 14 | 7 | 9 |
| Independent/other | 31 | 42 | 10 | 3 | 14 |
| Republican | 28 | 44 | 13 | 7 | 8 |
| Seattle | 38 | 37 | 14 | 3 | 8 |
| Baltimore | 29 | 39 | 13 | 9 | 10 |
| Chicago | 30 | 40 | 13 | 6 | 11 |
| San Antonio | 19 | 44 | 18 | 10 | 9 |
| Nashville | 23 | 48 | 8 | 7 | 15 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

# TABLE 30

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: CUT BOTH SIDES NUCLEAR ARSENALS, EVEN IF THIS MEAN INCREASING OUR NONNUCLEAR FORCE TO MATCH THEIRS

| We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals, even if that means increasing our nonnuclear conventional military strength (army, navy, etc) so it matches theirs | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 37 | 37 | 12 | 8 | 6 |
| Male | 40 | 37 | 12 | 7 | 3 |
| Female | 33 | 37 | 13 | 9 | 9 |
| White | 37 | 38 | 13 | 7 | 6 |
| Black | 29 | 36 | 18 | 11 | 7 |
| Hispanics | 39 | 32 | 10 | 18 | 2 |
| 18-29 | 34 | 43 | 10 | 7 | 6 |
| 30-39 | 44 | 34 | 11 | 8 | 3 |
| 40-49 | 29 | 37 | 17 | 12 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 30 | 40 | 16 | 6 | 8 |
| 65 and over | 48 | 28 | 9 | 8 | 7 |
| H.S. grad/less | 32 | 37 | 12 | 10 | 9 |
| Some college | 40 | 36 | 11 | 8 | 4 |
| College grad | 35 | 40 | 14 | 6 | 5 |
| Post grad | 38 | 43 | 15 | 3 | 2 |
| Democrat | 39 | 36 | 11 | 8 | 5 |
| Independent/other | 29 | 40 | 15 | 9 | 8 |
| Republican | 38 | 36 | 14 | 8 | 5 |
| Seattle | 41 | 38 | 9 | 5 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 40 | 31 | 13 | 11 | 5 |
| Chicago | 34 | 39 | 13 | 7 | 7 |
| San Antonio | 35 | 37 | 13 | 9 | 5 |
| Nashville | 34 | 39 | 14 | 7 | 6 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 31

## REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: STOP DEFENDING OTHER COUNTRIES AND DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA, EVEN IF WE MIGHT BE SURROUNDED BY ENEMIES

| We should stop defending other countries around the world and only defend North America, even if that means we might eventually be surrounded by enemies | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 4 | 8 | 21 | 64 | 3 |
| Male | 4 | 7 | 18 | 68 | 3 |
| Female | 3 | 9 | 24 | 61 | 3 |
| White | 3 | 7 | 20 | 68 | 2 |
| Black | 7 | 9 | 36 | 44 | 4 |
| Hispanics | 3 | 10 | 16 | 67 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 3 | 11 | 19 | 65 | 2 |
| 30-39 | 2 | 8 | 19 | 69 | 3 |
| 40-49 | 3 | 5 | 22 | 67 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 3 | 6 | 22 | 67 | 2 |
| 65 and over | 7 | 12 | 26 | 54 | 1 |
| H.S. grad/less | 5 | 10 | 27 | 56 | 3 |
| Some college | 4 | 8 | 19 | 68 | 2 |
| College grad | 3 | 9 | 13 | 75 | 1 |
| Post grad | 1 | 5 | 22 | 73 | -- |
| Democrat | 5 | 9 | 24 | 60 | 2 |
| Independent/other | 3 | 8 | 23 | 63 | 3 |
| Republican | 2 | 7 | 16 | 74 | 2 |
| Seattle | 5 | 12 | 19 | 62 | 3 |
| Baltimore | 4 | 8 | 29 | 56 | 4 |
| Chicago | 3 | 7 | 22 | 65 | 3 |
| San Antonio | 3 | 7 | 20 | 69 | 2 |
| Nashville | 4 | 8 | 17 | 69 | 3 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

# TABLE 32

## AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIETS ARE CONSTANTLY TESTING FOR WEAKNESS, AND TAKE ADVANTAGE WHEN THEY FIND IT

| The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 71 | 16 | 13 |
| | | | |
| Male | 72 | 16 | 12 |
| Female | 71 | 16 | 13 |
| | | | |
| White | 71 | 17 | 12 |
| Black | 68 | 14 | 19 |
| Hispanic | 81 | 12 | 7 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 63 | 22 | 15 |
| 30-39 | 63 | 23 | 14 |
| 40-49 | 75 | 16 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 80 | 9 | 11 |
| 65 and over | 82 | 10 | 8 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 76 | 15 | 10 |
| Some college | 71 | 17 | 12 |
| College grad | 65 | 21 | 14 |
| Post grad | 69 | 17 | 14 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 68 | 19 | 12 |
| Independent/other | 71 | 19 | 9 |
| Republican | 75 | 12 | 13 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 56 | 27 | 17 |
| Baltimore | 65 | 15 | 20 |
| Chicago | 72 | 16 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 84 | 9 | 7 |
| Nashville | 78 | 14 | 8 |

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 33

## AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: WE SHOULD LIVE AND LET LIVE

| We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both | Agree | Disagree | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % |
| Total | 49 | 37 | 14 |
| Male | 53 | 37 | 11 |
| Female | 46 | 38 | 16 |
| White | 49 | 38 | 13 |
| Black | 60 | 29 | 11 |
| Hispanic | 32 | 54 | 15 |
| 18-29 | 53 | 36 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 51 | 38 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 43 | 44 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 50 | 35 | 16 |
| 65 and over | 51 | 33 | 16 |
| H.S. grad/less | 44 | 40 | 16 |
| Some college | 50 | 39 | 11 |
| College grad | 53 | 34 | 13 |
| Post grad | 58 | 28 | 14 |
| Democrat | 58 | 30 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 54 | 34 | 12 |
| Republican | 38 | 47 | 15 |
| Seattle | 68 | 20 | 12 |
| Baltimore | 50 | 33 | 18 |
| Chicago | 56 | 37 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 33 | 54 | 13 |
| Nashville | 45 | 42 | 13 |

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 34

## AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIET UNION IS LIKE HITLER'S GERMANY -- AN EVIL EMPIRE

| The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 42 | 39 | 19 |
| Male | 41 | 45 | 15 |
| Female | 43 | 34 | 22 |
| White | 42 | 41 | 18 |
| Black | 34 | 46 | 20 |
| Hispanic | 57 | 19 | 24 |
| 18-29 | 30 | 52 | 18 |
| 30-39 | 43 | 43 | 14 |
| 40-49 | 42 | 36 | 21 |
| 50-64 | 49 | 28 | 23 |
| 65 and over | 53 | 32 | 15 |
| H.S. grad/less | 51 | 31 | 18 |
| Some college | 41 | 39 | 20 |
| College grad/more | 29 | 52 | 19 |
| Post grad | 29 | 59 | 13 |
| Democrat | 37 | 43 | 20 |
| Independent/other | 40 | 43 | 16 |
| Republican | 49 | 34 | 17 |
| Seattle | 25 | 60 | 16 |
| Baltimore | 40 | 39 | 21 |
| Chicago | 42 | 37 | 21 |
| San Antonio | 57 | 24 | 19 |
| Nashville | 46 | 38 | 16 |

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

# TABLE 35

## AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: BECAUSE THE SOVIETS WON'T KEEP THEIR END OF THE BARGIN, WE SHOULD NOT SIGN ANY ARMS AGREEMENTS WITH THEM

| Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 24 | 61 | 15 |
| Male | 18 | 71 | 11 |
| Female | 29 | 52 | 19 |
| White | 21 | 66 | 14 |
| Black | 34 | 45 | 21 |
| Hispanic | 42 | 47 | 12 |
| 18-29 | 27 | 60 | 13 |
| 30-39 | 23 | 65 | 12 |
| 40-49 | 22 | 61 | 17 |
| 50-64 | 25 | 57 | 19 |
| 65 and over | 20 | 71 | 9 |
| H.S. grad/less | 33 | 49 | 19 |
| Some college | 20 | 66 | 14 |
| College grad | 11 | 80 | 9 |
| Post grad | 19 | 70 | 11 |
| Democrat | 23 | 61 | 16 |
| Independent/other | 20 | 68 | 12 |
| Republican | 24 | 64 | 13 |
| Seattle | 9 | 79 | 12 |
| Baltimore | 29 | 57 | 14 |
| Chicago | 24 | 61 | 15 |
| San Antonio | 32 | 51 | 17 |
| Nashville | 25 | 59 | 16 |

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 36

## AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE U.S. WOULD BE SAFER IF WE STOPPED TRYING TO STOP COMMUNISM AND LEARNED TO LIVE WITH THEM

| The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 41 | 43 | 17 |
| | | | |
| Male | 40 | 45 | 15 |
| Female | 42 | 40 | 18 |
| | | | |
| White | 42 | 42 | 16 |
| Black | 35 | 44 | 21 |
| Hispanic | 35 | 51 | 13 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 42 | 41 | 16 |
| 30-39 | 46 | 42 | 12 |
| 40-49 | 37 | 44 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 38 | 42 | 20 |
| 65 and over | 44 | 45 | 12 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 37 | 44 | 19 |
| Some college | 41 | 41 | 18 |
| College grad | 43 | 46 | 11 |
| Post grad | 50 | 42 | 8 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 48 | 36 | 16 |
| Independent/other | 45 | 33 | 22 |
| Republican | 31 | 55 | 14 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 60 | 26 | 14 |
| Baltimore | 45 | 35 | 20 |
| Chicago | 36 | 49 | 16 |
| San Antonio | 26 | 59 | 15 |
| Nashville | 38 | 44 | 19 |

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 37

### AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: WHEN ALL IS SAID AND DONE, SOMEDAY WE'LL HAVE TO FIGHT THE SOVIET UNION TO STOP COMMUNISM

| When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism | Agree | Disagree | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % |
| Total | 23 | 48 | 29 |
| Male | 21 | 56 | 24 |
| Female | 26 | 41 | 33 |
| White | 20 | 52 | 29 |
| Black | 26 | 39 | 35 |
| Hispanic | 48 | 28 | 24 |
| 18-29 | 26 | 48 | 27 |
| 30-39 | 24 | 50 | 26 |
| 40-49 | 23 | 45 | 32 |
| 50-64 | 25 | 50 | 24 |
| 65 and over | 15 | 52 | 33 |
| H.S. grad/less | 30 | 40 | 30 |
| Some college | 21 | 49 | 30 |
| College grad | 18 | 61 | 21 |
| Post grad | 9 | 63 | 29 |
| Democrat | 20 | 54 | 26 |
| Independent/other | 22 | 53 | 24 |
| Republican | 25 | 44 | 31 |
| Seattle | 10 | 69 | 22 |
| Baltimore | 26 | 51 | 23 |
| Chicago | 19 | 48 | 32 |
| San Antonio | 42 | 30 | 29 |
| Nashville | 21 | 43 | 36 |

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 38

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: SHOULD AN AMERICAN AUTO COMPANY MAKE CARS IN RUSSIA TO SELL ON THE WORLD MARKET

| Should an American auto company make cars in the Soviet Union to sell on the world market which will help us compete with the Japanese but also benefit the Soviets | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 38 | 43 | 19 |
| Male | 46 | 41 | 13 |
| Female | 31 | 45 | 25 |
| White | 40 | 42 | 18 |
| Black | 32 | 50 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 24 | 47 | 30 |
| 18-29 | 43 | 33 | 24 |
| 30-39 | 41 | 42 | 17 |
| 40-49 | 40 | 39 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 33 | 55 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 31 | 54 | 15 |
| H.S. grad/less | 26 | 52 | 22 |
| Some college | 42 | 40 | 18 |
| College grad | 47 | 36 | 17 |
| Post grad | 58 | 30 | 12 |
| Democrat | 39 | 41 | 21 |
| Independent/other | 51 | 33 | 16 |
| Republican | 34 | 51 | 15 |
| Seattle | 62 | 21 | 17 |
| Baltimore | 32 | 46 | 22 |
| Chicago | 31 | 49 | 20 |
| San Antonio | 28 | 55 | 17 |
| Nashville | 37 | 44 | 19 |

"How do you feel about the following? A major American auto company is considering a joint venture to make cars in the Soviet Union. Those in favor say this would help an American company compete with the Japanese in the world market. But those opposed say this kind of arrangement would make the Soviets stronger and thus more of a threat in the long run. How do you feel? Do you favor or oppose an American company making cars in the Soviet Union to sell on the world market?"

## TABLE 39

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND WE ARE WEALTHIER AND OUR TECHNOLOGY IS BETTER

| We can gain the upper hand because we are wealthier and have higher technology | Convincing Argument<br>% | Not Convincing<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 43 | 50 | 7 |
| | | | |
| Male | 43 | 52 | 6 |
| Female | 43 | 48 | 9 |
| | | | |
| White | 41 | 52 | 7 |
| Black | 50 | 43 | 7 |
| Hispanic | 50 | 41 | 9 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 44 | 50 | 6 |
| 30-39 | 42 | 52 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 44 | 48 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 41 | 50 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 42 | 52 | 6 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 50 | 41 | 9 |
| Some college | 39 | 55 | 6 |
| College grad | 39 | 57 | 4 |
| Post grad | 33 | 62 | 6 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 41 | 51 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 33 | 61 | 6 |
| Republican | 47 | 48 | 5 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 30 | 65 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 40 | 50 | 10 |
| Chicago | 50 | 44 | 6 |
| San Antonio | 45 | 47 | 8 |
| Nashville | 51 | 41 | 8 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 40

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND
## GRENADA PROVES WE CAN AND SHOULD TRY TO STOP COMMUNIST EXPANSION

| The success of the Grenada invasion proves that we can and should try to stop communist expansion | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 40 | 46 | 14 |
| | | | |
| Male | 41 | 52 | 7 |
| Female | 38 | 42 | 20 |
| | | | |
| White | 39 | 48 | 13 |
| Black | 33 | 51 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 58 | 31 | 12 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 39 | 47 | 14 |
| 30-39 | 39 | 50 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 37 | 50 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 42 | 45 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 44 | 44 | 13 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 46 | 37 | 17 |
| Some college | 40 | 47 | 14 |
| College grad | 27 | 66 | 7 |
| Post grad | 38 | 58 | 5 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 34 | 53 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 33 | 50 | 17 |
| Republican | 48 | 39 | 12 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 24 | 66 | 10 |
| Baltimore | 36 | 48 | 16 |
| Chicago | 47 | 38 | 15 |
| San Antonio | 51 | 38 | 11 |
| Nashville | 40 | 42 | 18 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

# TABLE 41

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND
## THE U.S. HAS AN OBLIGATION TO DEFEND FREEDOM AND OPPOSE COMMUNISM

| The U.S. has an obligation to oppose Soviet and communist expansion and defend freedom around the world | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 55 | 33 | 12 |
| Male | 55 | 32 | 13 |
| Female | 55 | 34 | 12 |
| White | 56 | 32 | 12 |
| Black | 48 | 40 | 12 |
| Hispanic | 63 | 23 | 13 |
| 18-29 | 49 | 33 | 18 |
| 30-39 | 63 | 28 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 57 | 34 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 51 | 36 | 14 |
| 65 and over | 58 | 34 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 60 | 27 | 13 |
| Some college | 56 | 32 | 12 |
| College grad | 51 | 41 | 8 |
| Post grad | 46 | 38 | 17 |
| Democrat | 55 | 35 | 11 |
| Independent/other | 43 | 41 | 17 |
| Republican | 62 | 27 | 12 |
| Seattle | 39 | 52 | 9 |
| Baltimore | 51 | 32 | 17 |
| Chicago | 58 | 29 | 13 |
| San Antonio | 65 | 23 | 12 |
| Nashville | 62 | 27 | 11 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 42

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND
## WE ARE ALREADY IN A WINNER-TAKE-ALL COMPETITION WITH THE SOVIETS

| We are already in a winner-take-all competition with the Soviets and, realistically speaking, this is the only way to keep them at bay | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 30 | 55 | 15 |
| Male | 28 | 60 | 12 |
| Female | 32 | 50 | 18 |
| White | 28 | 59 | 14 |
| Black | 39 | 45 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 50 | 33 | 17 |
| 18-29 | 29 | 53 | 18 |
| 30-39 | 32 | 56 | 13 |
| 40-49 | 34 | 54 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 59 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 29 | 56 | 15 |
| H.S. grad/less | 34 | 47 | 19 |
| Some college | 31 | 55 | 13 |
| College grad | 22 | 70 | 8 |
| Post grad | 29 | 64 | 6 |
| Democrat | 31 | 53 | 16 |
| Independent/other | 19 | 67 | 14 |
| Republican | 34 | 54 | 12 |
| Seattle | 15 | 73 | 13 |
| Baltimore | 32 | 51 | 17 |
| Chicago | 31 | 52 | 17 |
| San Antonio | 40 | 47 | 13 |
| Nashville | 33 | 52 | 15 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 43

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND THIS IS THE FORMULA FOR AN ENDLESS ARMS RACE

| Trying to gain military superiority is a formula for an endless arms race | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 75 | 19 | 6 |
| Male | 79 | 17 | 4 |
| Female | 72 | 20 | 8 |
| White | 78 | 17 | 6 |
| Black | 70 | 24 | 7 |
| Hispanic | 66 | 31 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 78 | 18 | 5 |
| 30-39 | 80 | 16 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 72 | 21 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 68 | 22 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 81 | 18 | 2 |
| H.S. grad/less | 67 | 24 | 9 |
| Some college | 77 | 18 | 5 |
| College grad | 85 | 13 | 2 |
| Post grad | 85 | 13 | 3 |
| Democrat | 75 | 19 | 7 |
| Independent/other | 83 | 10 | 7 |
| Republican | 75 | 22 | 3 |
| Seattle | 88 | 7 | 4 |
| Baltimore | 75 | 21 | 4 |
| Chicago | 70 | 22 | 8 |
| San Antonio | 71 | 24 | 6 |
| Nashville | 72 | 19 | 10 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 44

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND
## TRYING TO STOP COMMUNIST EXPANSION WILL LEAD TO ANOTHER VIETNAM

| Trying to stop communist expansion around the world will only lead us into more Vietnams | Convincing Argument<br>% | Not Convincing<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 49 | 38 | 14 |
| | | | |
| Male | 48 | 42 | 11 |
| Female | 50 | 34 | 16 |
| | | | |
| White | 49 | 39 | 13 |
| Black | 56 | 33 | 12 |
| Hispanic | 45 | 44 | 11 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 49 | 35 | 15 |
| 30-39 | 55 | 35 | 10 |
| 40-49 | 51 | 36 | 14 |
| 50-64 | 40 | 44 | 16 |
| 65 and over | 50 | 41 | 9 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 49 | 33 | 18 |
| Some college | 47 | 42 | 11 |
| College grad/more | 52 | 40 | 8 |
| Post grad | 52 | 40 | 8 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 56 | 31 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 48 | 35 | 17 |
| Republican | 41 | 47 | 12 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 62 | 27 | 12 |
| Baltimore | 53 | 34 | 14 |
| Chicago | 41 | 42 | 17 |
| San Antonio | 36 | 49 | 15 |
| Nashville | 51 | 39 | 11 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 45

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND THIS FUTURE WOULD BE TOO EXPENSIVE

| This future would be too expensive because it would mean enormous defense spending, year after year | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 70 | 21 | 8 |
| Male | 72 | 23 | 5 |
| Female | 69 | 20 | 11 |
| White | 70 | 23 | 8 |
| Black | 73 | 22 | 5 |
| Hispanic | 69 | 20 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 77 | 16 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 75 | 22 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 64 | 25 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 70 | 21 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 64 | 29 | 7 |
| H.S. grad/less | 63 | 23 | 14 |
| Some college | 70 | 24 | 6 |
| College grad/more | 79 | 20 | 1 |
| Post grad | 85 | 12 | 3 |
| Democrat | 75 | 19 | 6 |
| Independent/other | 67 | 25 | 8 |
| Republican | 67 | 25 | 9 |
| Seattle | 79 | 16 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 72 | 20 | 9 |
| Chicago | 71 | 20 | 10 |
| San Antonio | 68 | 23 | 9 |
| Nashville | 62 | 30 | 8 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 46

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND THIS FUTURE WOULD BE TOO DANGEROUS

| This future would be too dangerous because the Soviets might feel like a cornered rat | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 48 | 37 | 15 |
| Male | 48 | 38 | 14 |
| Female | 48 | 36 | 16 |
| White | 49 | 37 | 14 |
| Black | 49 | 33 | 18 |
| Hispanic | 44 | 41 | 14 |
| 18-29 | 55 | 30 | 15 |
| 30-39 | 52 | 35 | 13 |
| 40-49 | 50 | 40 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 38 | 46 | 16 |
| 65 and over | 45 | 38 | 17 |
| H.S. grad/less | 47 | 35 | 18 |
| Some college | 48 | 37 | 15 |
| College grad | 54 | 39 | 7 |
| Post grad | 50 | 44 | 7 |
| Democrat | 54 | 31 | 15 |
| Independent/other | 47 | 39 | 15 |
| Republican | 43 | 44 | 14 |
| Seattle | 59 | 27 | 14 |
| Baltimore | 45 | 37 | 19 |
| Chicago | 45 | 36 | 19 |
| San Antonio | 40 | 49 | 12 |
| Nashville | 54 | 35 | 11 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 47

## OVERALL REACTION TO FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND

| Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about Future One | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 26 | 23 | 17 | 24 | 10 |
| Male | 26 | 22 | 17 | 25 | 10 |
| Female | 27 | 23 | 17 | 23 | 10 |
| White | 24 | 23 | 18 | 26 | 10 |
| Black | 30 | 26 | 13 | 23 | 9 |
| Hispanics | 45 | 22 | 13 | 11 | 9 |
| 18-29 | 19 | 23 | 18 | 29 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 23 | 20 | 17 | 31 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 29 | 24 | 16 | 23 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 28 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 11 |
| 65 and over | 35 | 29 | 13 | 16 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 31 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 16 |
| Some college | 25 | 24 | 16 | 27 | 9 |
| College grad | 20 | 24 | 18 | 35 | 4 |
| Post grad | 19 | 24 | 17 | 38 | 2 |
| Democrat | 25 | 20 | 17 | 28 | 9 |
| Independent/other | 17 | 21 | 15 | 36 | 11 |
| Republican | 30 | 27 | 17 | 17 | 9 |
| Seattle | 18 | 18 | 17 | 43 | 4 |
| Baltimore | 28 | 24 | 17 | 21 | 10 |
| Chicago | 26 | 24 | 18 | 20 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 35 | 26 | 18 | 13 | 9 |
| Nashville | 26 | 23 | 15 | 22 | 15 |

"Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand. Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs.

PRO: History proves that strength is the only thing the Russians respect.
CON: Risky: will make the Soviets feel as if they are backed into a corner."

## TABLE 48

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT SO THE WORLD WON'T BE DESTROYED

| We should drastically cut the number of nuclear weapons on both sides so that, if somehow they are ever used, the whole world won't be destroyed | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 75 | 22 | 4 |
| Male | 78 | 21 | 2 |
| Female | 72 | 23 | 5 |
| White | 77 | 21 | 3 |
| Black | 67 | 27 | 7 |
| Hispanic | 68 | 30 | 2 |
| 18-29 | 77 | 21 | 3 |
| 30-39 | 74 | 24 | 3 |
| 40-49 | 66 | 32 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 75 | 20 | 6 |
| 65 and over | 86 | 14 | 1 |
| H.S. grad/less | 73 | 23 | 5 |
| Some college | 75 | 22 | 3 |
| College grad | 78 | 22 | -- |
| Post grad | 78 | 21 | 1 |
| Democrat | 75 | 22 | 2 |
| Independent/other | 72 | 23 | 5 |
| Republican | 75 | 23 | 2 |
| Seattle | 83 | 15 | 3 |
| Baltimore | 68 | 25 | 7 |
| Chicago | 79 | 17 | 4 |
| San Antonio | 70 | 28 | 2 |
| Nashville | 73 | 25 | 2 |

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

# TABLE 49

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT
## WE'LL KNOW IF THEY CHEAT

| Under their new leader, the Soviets will allow on-site inspection and so we'll know if they cheat | Convincing Argument<br>% | Not Convincing<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 47 | 41 | 12 |
| Male | 53 | 36 | 11 |
| Female | 42 | 45 | 13 |
| White | 48 | 41 | 12 |
| Black | 43 | 46 | 10 |
| Hispanic | 48 | 46 | 6 |
| 18-29 | 44 | 40 | 17 |
| 30-39 | 48 | 41 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 48 | 44 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 48 | 43 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 52 | 38 | 11 |
| H.S. grad/less | 44 | 45 | 11 |
| Some college | 52 | 37 | 11 |
| College grad | 44 | 45 | 11 |
| Post grad | 47 | 40 | 14 |
| Democrat | 47 | 39 | 14 |
| Independent/other | 52 | 38 | 10 |
| Republican | 46 | 45 | 9 |
| Seattle | 54 | 33 | 13 |
| Baltimore | 47 | 37 | 16 |
| Chicago | 46 | 37 | 17 |
| San Antonio | 42 | 52 | 6 |
| Nashville | 45 | 46 | 9 |

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

## TABLE 50

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT REACH AN AGREEMENT TO PREVENT LOCAL CONFLICTS FROM ESCALATING

| We and the Soviets should reach agreements to prevent local conflicts, such as in the Middle East, from escalating because they are the major way that a nuclear war could start | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 75 | 17 | 8 |
| Male | 79 | 15 | 6 |
| Female | 70 | 20 | 10 |
| White | 76 | 15 | 9 |
| Black | 71 | 26 | 3 |
| Hispanic | 66 | 28 | 6 |
| 18-29 | 76 | 17 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 77 | 18 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 71 | 21 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 71 | 19 | 11 |
| 65 and over | 83 | 9 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 68 | 19 | 14 |
| Some college | 78 | 16 | 6 |
| College grad | 82 | 15 | 3 |
| Post grad | 76 | 21 | 3 |
| Democrat | 77 | 16 | 7 |
| Independent/other | 76 | 17 | 8 |
| Republican | 75 | 18 | 8 |
| Seattle | 83 | 11 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 72 | 20 | 8 |
| Chicago | 74 | 15 | 11 |
| San Antonio | 68 | 23 | 9 |
| Nashville | 76 | 17 | 7 |

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

# TABLE 51

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT LESS RISK IN OUR OPPOSING THIRD WORLD COMMUNIST EXPANSION

| Eliminating the nuclear threat will enable us to oppose communist expansion in the Third World with less risk | Convincing Argument | Not Convincing | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % |
| Total | 42 | 42 | 16 |
| Male | 46 | 44 | 11 |
| Female | 38 | 41 | 21 |
| White | 40 | 44 | 16 |
| Black | 45 | 38 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 53 | 33 | 15 |
| 18-29 | 43 | 35 | 22 |
| 30-39 | 46 | 45 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 39 | 48 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 41 | 44 | 15 |
| 65 and over | 41 | 42 | 17 |
| H.S. grad/less | 39 | 40 | 22 |
| Some college | 45 | 42 | 14 |
| College grad | 42 | 47 | 12 |
| Post grad | 42 | 46 | 12 |
| Democrat | 42 | 43 | 16 |
| Independent/other | 38 | 45 | 17 |
| Republican | 43 | 42 | 15 |
| Seattle | 39 | 46 | 14 |
| Baltimore | 37 | 43 | 20 |
| Chicago | 50 | 34 | 16 |
| San Antonio | 37 | 47 | 16 |
| Nashville | 46 | 40 | 15 |

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

# TABLE 52

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT
## THE SOVIETS WILL CHEAT

| The Soviets can't be trusted and will cheat on arms control treaties | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 47 | 37 | 16 |
| | | | |
| Male | 43 | 42 | 14 |
| Female | 51 | 32 | 17 |
| | | | |
| White | 47 | 37 | 17 |
| Black | 42 | 42 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 64 | 31 | 6 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 41 | 40 | 19 |
| 30-39 | 46 | 40 | 14 |
| 40-49 | 48 | 40 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 52 | 30 | 18 |
| 65 and over | 53 | 35 | 13 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 52 | 32 | 15 |
| Some college | 50 | 34 | 16 |
| College grad | 35 | 51 | 14 |
| Post grad | 36 | 46 | 18 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 44 | 40 | 16 |
| Independent/other | 39 | 46 | 15 |
| Republican | 53 | 31 | 16 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 25 | 59 | 16 |
| Baltimore | 48 | 33 | 19 |
| Chicago | 45 | 39 | 16 |
| San Antonio | 63 | 26 | 11 |
| Nashville | 57 | 26 | 17 |

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

## TABLE 53

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT
## NUCLEAR WEAPONS HAVE KEPT THE PEACE SINCE WWII

| We should not reach agreements to end the arms race because nuclear weapons have kept the peace since WWII | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 31 | 57 | 12 |
| Male | 28 | 63 | 9 |
| Female | 34 | 51 | 15 |
| White | 31 | 58 | 12 |
| Black | 34 | 49 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 34 | 55 | 12 |
| 18-29 | 33 | 51 | 16 |
| 30-39 | 31 | 59 | 10 |
| 40-49 | 34 | 58 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 30 | 56 | 14 |
| 65 and over | 27 | 65 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 37 | 47 | 16 |
| Some college | 29 | 60 | 11 |
| College grad | 26 | 66 | 8 |
| Post grad | 28 | 69 | 4 |
| Democrat | 30 | 57 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 30 | 61 | 10 |
| Republican | 32 | 57 | 11 |
| Seattle | 23 | 69 | 8 |
| Baltimore | 32 | 51 | 17 |
| Chicago | 29 | 59 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 36 | 55 | 9 |
| Nashville | 38 | 49 | 13 |

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

## TABLE 54

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT WOULD LEAVE THE SOVIETS WITH AN ADVANTAGE IN CONVENTIONAL FORCES

| This Future would leave the Soviets with a large advantage in nonnuclear (conventional) forces such as tanks and soldiers | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 53 | 33 | 14 |
| | | | |
| Male | 55 | 36 | 9 |
| Female | 51 | 31 | 19 |
| | | | |
| White | 56 | 32 | 12 |
| Black | 41 | 38 | 22 |
| Hispanic | 42 | 42 | 16 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 53 | 31 | 16 |
| 30-39 | 58 | 30 | 13 |
| 40-49 | 47 | 42 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 57 | 31 | 12 |
| 65 and over | 55 | 31 | 14 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 49 | 33 | 18 |
| Some college | 53 | 34 | 13 |
| College grad/more | 58 | 35 | 7 |
| Post grad | 61 | 31 | 8 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 48 | 38 | 14 |
| Independent/other | 53 | 35 | 12 |
| Republican | 63 | 26 | 12 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 52 | 35 | 13 |
| Baltimore | 45 | 34 | 21 |
| Chicago | 54 | 34 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 57 | 31 | 12 |
| Nashville | 57 | 31 | 12 |

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

## TABLE 55

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT NOT REALISTIC TO COMPETE IN THIRD WORLD AND COOPERATE ON NUCLEAR REDUCTION

| It's just not realistic to think that we can compete with the Soviets in the Third World while, at the same time, cooperate with them to eliminate the risk of nuclear war | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 38 | 45 | 17 |
| Male | 32 | 52 | 16 |
| Female | 44 | 38 | 18 |
| White | 37 | 46 | 18 |
| Black | 45 | 34 | 21 |
| Hispanic | 53 | 36 | 11 |
| 18-29 | 45 | 35 | 20 |
| 30-39 | 39 | 45 | 16 |
| 40-49 | 41 | 45 | 14 |
| 50-64 | 34 | 46 | 21 |
| 65 and over | 33 | 57 | 10 |
| High school graduate | 41 | 37 | 21 |
| Some college | 40 | 45 | 16 |
| College grad | 36 | 51 | 13 |
| Post grad | 30 | 57 | 13 |
| Democrat | 42 | 41 | 17 |
| Independent/other | 37 | 54 | 9 |
| Republican | 36 | 47 | 18 |
| Seattle | 32 | 55 | 13 |
| Baltimore | 34 | 43 | 23 |
| Chicago | 38 | 45 | 18 |
| San Antonio | 42 | 44 | 14 |
| Nashville | 46 | 37 | 18 |

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

## TABLE 56

## OVERALL REACTION TO FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE

| Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about Future Two | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 21 | 34 | 21 | 13 | 11 |
| Male | 24 | 38 | 18 | 10 | 10 |
| Female | 18 | 30 | 24 | 16 | 12 |
| White | 21 | 34 | 23 | 13 | 10 |
| Black | 21 | 35 | 20 | 11 | 12 |
| Hispanics | 32 | 27 | 13 | 16 | 11 |
| 18-29 | 17 | 33 | 26 | 13 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 24 | 39 | 17 | 15 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 18 | 31 | 28 | 13 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 40 | 18 | 12 | 15 |
| 65 and over | 35 | 24 | 17 | 13 | 12 |
| H.S. grad/less | 21 | 28 | 22 | 14 | 15 |
| Some college | 24 | 31 | 22 | 11 | 11 |
| College grad | 15 | 47 | 24 | 12 | 2 |
| Post grad | 23 | 43 | 16 | 12 | 6 |
| Democrat | 21 | 31 | 21 | 15 | 12 |
| Independent/other | 19 | 36 | 26 | 9 | 11 |
| Republican | 22 | 36 | 21 | 13 | 8 |
| Seattle | 22 | 38 | 17 | 16 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 20 | 37 | 23 | 10 | 11 |
| Chicago | 23 | 29 | 22 | 12 | 14 |
| San Antonio | 23 | 34 | 20 | 14 | 10 |
| Nashville | 17 | 31 | 25 | 13 | 14 |

"Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat: Compete Otherwise. Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the Third World.

PRO: The way things are going now, it's only a matter of time before a nuclear war.
CON: The Soviets can't be trusted to keep such agreements."

# TABLE 57

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING NUCLEAR WEAPONS, POLLUTION, AND AIDS ARE THE REAL PROBLEMS FACING US BOTH

| The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution and AID are the real problems facing us and the Soviets | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 83 | 14 | 3 |
| Male | 84 | 14 | 3 |
| Female | 83 | 13 | 4 |
| White | 84 | 14 | 3 |
| Black | 87 | 9 | 4 |
| Hispanic | 78 | 19 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 86 | 11 | 3 |
| 30-39 | 84 | 14 | 3 |
| 40-49 | 83 | 14 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 84 | 15 | 1 |
| 65 and over | 83 | 13 | 4 |
| H.S. grad/less | 84 | 11 | 5 |
| Some college | 83 | 14 | 2 |
| College grad | 86 | 12 | 2 |
| Post grad | 81 | 19 | -- |
| Democrat | 88 | 11 | 2 |
| Independent/other | 82 | 14 | 4 |
| Republican | 81 | 16 | 3 |
| Seattle | 89 | 10 | 1 |
| Baltimore | 87 | 9 | 5 |
| Chicago | 82 | 14 | 4 |
| San Antonio | 71 | 24 | 5 |
| Nashville | 87 | 12 | 1 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

# TABLE 58

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
## A BASIC CHANGE TO PRODUCE TRUST IS THE ONLY WAY TO END THE ARMS RACE

| A basic change in the U.S.-Soviet relationship that improves trust is the only way we'll be able to end the arms race | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 73 | 20 | 7 |
| Male | 73 | 21 | 6 |
| Female | 73 | 19 | 7 |
| White | 73 | 20 | 7 |
| Black | 76 | 19 | 5 |
| Hispanic | 65 | 30 | 5 |
| 18-29 | 72 | 22 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 66 | 25 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 74 | 22 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 76 | 17 | 8 |
| 65 and over | 81 | 16 | 3 |
| H.S. grad/less | 69 | 22 | 8 |
| Some college | 77 | 19 | 4 |
| College grad | 78 | 18 | 4 |
| Post grad | 65 | 26 | 10 |
| Democrat | 80 | 16 | 4 |
| Independent/other | 77 | 18 | 5 |
| Republican | 65 | 27 | 9 |
| Seattle | 79 | 16 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 75 | 21 | 4 |
| Chicago | 73 | 16 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 64 | 29 | 7 |
| Nashville | 75 | 20 | 6 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

# TABLE 59

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
## THE SOVIETS SEEM WILLING TO GO DOWN THIS PATH

| The Soviets seem willing to go down this path | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 40 | 38 | 23 |
| | | | |
| Male | 43 | 36 | 21 |
| Female | 36 | 39 | 25 |
| | | | |
| White | 41 | 38 | 22 |
| Black | 34 | 37 | 29 |
| Hispanic | 34 | 40 | 27 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 36 | 35 | 29 |
| 30-39 | 45 | 44 | 10 |
| 40-49 | 40 | 36 | 24 |
| 50-64 | 37 | 41 | 22 |
| 65 and over | 44 | 30 | 26 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 36 | 38 | 26 |
| Some college | 41 | 37 | 22 |
| College grad/more | 45 | 35 | 20 |
| Post grad | 40 | 43 | 17 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 43 | 32 | 26 |
| Independent/other | 50 | 29 | 21 |
| Republican | 34 | 47 | 20 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 56 | 28 | 16 |
| Baltimore | 36 | 38 | 26 |
| Chicago | 38 | 30 | 32 |
| San Antonio | 29 | 50 | 21 |
| Nashville | 39 | 42 | 20 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

# TABLE 60

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
## WE MUST CHANGE OUR BASIC RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SOVIETS IN ORDER TO BE SAFE

| Unless we change our relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreements won't make us safe | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 73 | 18 | 10 |
| Male | 71 | 20 | 9 |
| Female | 74 | 15 | 10 |
| White | 72 | 19 | 9 |
| Black | 79 | 11 | 10 |
| Hispanic | 68 | 17 | 16 |
| 18-29 | 72 | 18 | 10 |
| 30-39 | 77 | 13 | 10 |
| 40-49 | 74 | 20 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 69 | 20 | 11 |
| 65 and over | 73 | 19 | 9 |
| H.S. grad/less | 65 | 23 | 12 |
| Some college | 76 | 14 | 11 |
| College grad/more | 83 | 15 | 2 |
| Post grad | 76 | 18 | 6 |
| Democrat | 77 | 13 | 10 |
| Independent/other | 79 | 12 | 9 |
| Republican | 66 | 26 | 8 |
| Seattle | 79 | 13 | 8 |
| Baltimore | 72 | 16 | 13 |
| Chicago | 72 | 16 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 70 | 21 | 9 |
| Nashville | 71 | 22 | 8 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

# TABLE 61

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING MEANS GIVING UP THE FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNIST EXPANSION

| This Future would mean giving up the fight against communist expansion around the world and accepting a ruthless dictatorship as an equal partner | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 26 | 59 | 15 |
| | | | |
| Male | 28 | 62 | 10 |
| Female | 24 | 56 | 20 |
| | | | |
| White | 27 | 59 | 14 |
| Black | 24 | 60 | 16 |
| Hispanic | 28 | 59 | 13 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 30 | 52 | 18 |
| 30-39 | 29 | 59 | 12 |
| 40-49 | 25 | 63 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 26 | 53 | 21 |
| 65 and over | 21 | 73 | 6 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 26 | 53 | 22 |
| Some college | 29 | 61 | 11 |
| College grad/more | 23 | 70 | 8 |
| Post grad | 29 | 62 | 9 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 22 | 65 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 21 | 63 | 17 |
| Republican | 35 | 51 | 14 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 18 | 71 | 11 |
| Baltimore | 18 | 63 | 19 |
| Chicago | 32 | 54 | 15 |
| San Antonio | 36 | 49 | 15 |
| Nashville | 28 | 58 | 15 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 62

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
## WE WOULD HAVE TO SHARE OUR HIGH TECHNOLOGY

| This Future would require us sharing our high technology and giving up our main edge | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 43 | 48 | 9 |
| | | | |
| Male | 43 | 50 | 7 |
| Female | 43 | 46 | 12 |
| | | | |
| White | 44 | 48 | 8 |
| Black | 36 | 51 | 13 |
| Hispanic | 38 | 54 | 8 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 50 | 44 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 47 | 46 | 7 |
| 40-49 | 36 | 53 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 42 | 46 | 11 |
| 65 and over | 37 | 55 | 8 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 43 | 49 | 8 |
| Some college | 42 | 48 | 9 |
| College grad | 45 | 44 | 11 |
| Post grad | 41 | 55 | 4 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 39 | 50 | 11 |
| Independent/other | 37 | 58 | 6 |
| Republican | 51 | 43 | 7 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 33 | 58 | 9 |
| Baltimore | 34 | 52 | 15 |
| Chicago | 52 | 40 | 8 |
| San Antonio | 50 | 42 | 8 |
| Nashville | 45 | 49 | 7 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 63

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING MEANS GIVING UP OR SHARING SDI

| This Future would mean sharing or not building SDI and giving up the idea of gaining clear military superiority. | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 42 | 45 | 13 |
| Male | 44 | 47 | 10 |
| Female | 41 | 44 | 15 |
| White | 42 | 47 | 12 |
| Black | 34 | 44 | 22 |
| Hispanic | 57 | 35 | 9 |
| 18-29 | 43 | 43 | 13 |
| 30-39 | 47 | 45 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 46 | 43 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 35 | 52 | 14 |
| 65 and over | 40 | 47 | 13 |
| H.S. grad/less | 40 | 45 | 15 |
| Some college | 43 | 45 | 12 |
| College grad | 46 | 48 | 7 |
| Post grad | 46 | 47 | 7 |
| Democrat | 39 | 48 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 39 | 48 | 14 |
| Republican | 49 | 41 | 10 |
| Seattle | 35 | 55 | 9 |
| Baltimore | 32 | 49 | 19 |
| Chicago | 49 | 38 | 14 |
| San Antonio | 49 | 40 | 12 |
| Nashville | 45 | 45 | 10 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 64

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING THE SOVIETS WILL TRICK US AND TURN ON US

| The Soviets will trick us, pretend to cooperate, and then turn on us as they have in the past | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 42 | 39 | 19 |
| Male | 38 | 44 | 18 |
| Female | 46 | 35 | 19 |
| White | 42 | 41 | 17 |
| Black | 34 | 40 | 25 |
| Hispanic | 60 | 22 | 19 |
| 18-29 | 39 | 41 | 20 |
| 30-39 | 45 | 43 | 12 |
| 40-49 | 39 | 39 | 22 |
| 50-64 | 46 | 37 | 18 |
| 65 and over | 48 | 37 | 16 |
| H.S. grad/less | 52 | 31 | 18 |
| Some college | 42 | 39 | 19 |
| College grad | 27 | 56 | 18 |
| Post grad | 30 | 51 | 19 |
| Democrat | 37 | 42 | 21 |
| Independent/other | 37 | 47 | 17 |
| Republican | 50 | 34 | 15 |
| Seattle | 25 | 58 | 17 |
| Baltimore | 38 | 38 | 24 |
| Chicago | 37 | 44 | 19 |
| San Antonio | 60 | 27 | 14 |
| Nashville | 52 | 29 | 19 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 65

## OVERALL REACTION TO FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

| Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about Future Three | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 39 | 31 | 13 | 8 | 9 |
| Male | 39 | 34 | 12 | 7 | 8 |
| Female | 39 | 28 | 14 | 10 | 10 |
| White | 40 | 30 | 13 | 9 | 8 |
| Black | 35 | 34 | 19 | 4 | 9 |
| Hispanics | 35 | 31 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| 18-29 | 35 | 33 | 13 | 8 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 39 | 34 | 14 | 10 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 41 | 30 | 13 | 11 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 36 | 28 | 15 | 7 | 15 |
| 65 and over | 53 | 27 | 7 | 6 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 35 | 27 | 13 | 11 | 15 |
| Some college | 45 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 6 |
| College grad | 38 | 38 | 12 | 7 | 4 |
| Post grad | 39 | 31 | 13 | 14 | 3 |
| Democrat | 44 | 30 | 11 | 6 | 10 |
| Independent/other | 40 | 34 | 12 | 7 | 7 |
| Republican | 35 | 31 | 16 | 12 | 6 |
| Seattle | 54 | 27 | 8 | 6 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 43 | 31 | 14 | 5 | 7 |
| Chicago | 36 | 31 | 13 | 7 | 13 |
| San Antonio | 28 | 31 | 16 | 15 | 11 |
| Nashville | 34 | 34 | 14 | 9 | 9 |

"Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving. Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world.

PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to build trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us."

## TABLE 66

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
## OUR ALLIES CAN DEFEND THEMSELVES

| Our allies are perfectly capable of defending themselves and can afford it | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 33 | 59 | 9 |
| | | | |
| Male | 34 | 60 | 6 |
| Female | 32 | 57 | 11 |
| | | | |
| White | 32 | 60 | 8 |
| Black | 37 | 50 | 12 |
| Hispanic | 28 | 65 | 8 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 39 | 53 | 8 |
| 30-39 | 32 | 60 | 8 |
| 40-49 | 27 | 68 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 29 | 60 | 12 |
| 65 and over | 34 | 57 | 9 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 37 | 53 | 11 |
| Some college | 29 | 63 | 9 |
| College grad | 28 | 68 | 4 |
| Post grad | 37 | 58 | 6 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 34 | 57 | 9 |
| Independent/other | 38 | 49 | 14 |
| Republican | 27 | 67 | 6 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 39 | 51 | 11 |
| Baltimore | 30 | 59 | 12 |
| Chicago | 31 | 61 | 8 |
| San Antonio | 31 | 64 | 5 |
| Nashville | 35 | 58 | 7 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 67

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
## WE CAN'T AFFORD TO DEFEND SO MANY NATIONS

| Especially in view of our problems here in the U.S., we can't afford to defend so many nations | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 55 | 38 | 6 |
| | | | |
| Male | 51 | 43 | 6 |
| Female | 59 | 34 | 7 |
| | | | |
| White | 54 | 39 | 7 |
| Black | 59 | 34 | 7 |
| Hispanic | 56 | 41 | 3 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 60 | 33 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 54 | 41 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 50 | 45 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 52 | 39 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 58 | 38 | 4 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 55 | 39 | 6 |
| Some college | 53 | 41 | 6 |
| College grad | 49 | 44 | 7 |
| Post grad | 68 | 25 | 7 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 59 | 33 | 7 |
| Independent/other | 57 | 36 | 6 |
| Republican | 48 | 47 | 5 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 62 | 32 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 54 | 39 | 7 |
| Chicago | 52 | 42 | 7 |
| San Antonio | 54 | 43 | 3 |
| Nashville | 55 | 37 | 9 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 68

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
## BEING "POLICEMAN" INCREASES THE CHANCES OF NUCLEAR WAR

| Being the "world's policeman" increases our chances of getting dragged into a nuclear war | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 58 | 34 | 8 |
| | | | |
| Male | 55 | 39 | 7 |
| Female | 62 | 30 | 8 |
| | | | |
| White | 57 | 37 | 7 |
| Black | 65 | 22 | 13 |
| Hispanic | 61 | 34 | 5 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 62 | 31 | 8 |
| 30-39 | 52 | 41 | 8 |
| 40-49 | 57 | 38 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 55 | 37 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 65 | 29 | 6 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 62 | 27 | 10 |
| Some college | 56 | 40 | 5 |
| College grad/more | 50 | 44 | 6 |
| Post grad | 63 | 31 | 7 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 65 | 27 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 58 | 36 | 6 |
| Republican | 51 | 43 | 6 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 61 | 34 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 57 | 33 | 10 |
| Chicago | 59 | 31 | 11 |
| San Antonio | 56 | 39 | 5 |
| Nashville | 58 | 35 | 6 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 69

## ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA COUNTRIES WE PROTECT ARE BEATING US ECONOMICALLY

| While we spend billions to defend Japan and Europe, they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 79 | 16 | 5 |
| Male | 80 | 16 | 4 |
| Female | 78 | 16 | 7 |
| White | 80 | 16 | 4 |
| Black | 71 | 20 | 9 |
| Hispanic | 74 | 19 | 7 |
| 18-29 | 74 | 19 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 77 | 20 | 3 |
| 40-49 | 78 | 17 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 83 | 11 | 5 |
| 65 and over | 85 | 13 | 3 |
| H.S. grad/less | 75 | 17 | 8 |
| Some college | 82 | 15 | 3 |
| College grad | 77 | 20 | 3 |
| Post grad | 80 | 16 | 5 |
| Democrat | 81 | 14 | 5 |
| Independent/other | 75 | 21 | 4 |
| Republican | 79 | 17 | 5 |
| Seattle | 80 | 13 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 72 | 19 | 9 |
| Chicago | 82 | 15 | 4 |
| San Antonio | 79 | 18 | 3 |
| Nashville | 81 | 16 | 4 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 70

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
## EVENTUALLY THE WORLD MAY BE FILLED WITH ENEMIES

| Our allies may make concessions to the Soviets and eventually leave us alone in a world filled with enemies | Convincing Argument<br>% | Not Convincing<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 55 | 34 | 12 |
| Male | 55 | 37 | 8 |
| Female | 54 | 31 | 15 |
| White | 57 | 33 | 11 |
| Black | 50 | 36 | 15 |
| Hispanic | 48 | 42 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 63 | 26 | 12 |
| 30-39 | 62 | 32 | 7 |
| 40-49 | 51 | 40 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 46 | 35 | 19 |
| 65 and over | 49 | 40 | 11 |
| H.S. grad/less | 52 | 33 | 15 |
| Some college | 55 | 35 | 10 |
| College grad | 62 | 31 | 7 |
| Post grad | 52 | 37 | 10 |
| Democrat | 50 | 35 | 15 |
| Independent/other | 51 | 39 | 10 |
| Republican | 62 | 29 | 9 |
| Seattle | 51 | 40 | 9 |
| Baltimore | 51 | 32 | 17 |
| Chicago | 55 | 33 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 57 | 34 | 9 |
| Nashville | 61 | 29 | 10 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 71

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA WE HAVE A MORAL OBLIGATION TO DEFEND FREEDOM

| We have a moral obligation to defend freedom around the world | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 54 | 36 | 11 |
| | | | |
| Male | 54 | 35 | 11 |
| Female | 53 | 36 | 11 |
| | | | |
| White | 54 | 37 | 10 |
| Black | 50 | 37 | 13 |
| Hispanic | 63 | 27 | 11 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 55 | 34 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 67 | 27 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 54 | 36 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 41 | 46 | 12 |
| 65 and over | 49 | 39 | 13 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 57 | 33 | 11 |
| Some college | 53 | 37 | 10 |
| College grad | 49 | 44 | 7 |
| Post grad | 54 | 35 | 11 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 51 | 38 | 12 |
| Independent/other | 41 | 50 | 9 |
| Republican | 63 | 28 | 9 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 36 | 52 | 12 |
| Baltimore | 51 | 33 | 17 |
| Chicago | 54 | 37 | 9 |
| San Antonio | 63 | 29 | 8 |
| Nashville | 64 | 29 | 8 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

# TABLE 72

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
## IT IS U.S. STRENGTH THAT KEEPS RUTHLESS COUNTRIES FROM STARTING TROUBLE

| History shows that it is U.S. strength that keeps ruthless, aggressive countries from starting trouble around the world | Convincing Argument % | Not Convincing % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 61 | 28 | 11 |
| Male | 59 | 30 | 11 |
| Female | 63 | 26 | 11 |
| White | 61 | 28 | 11 |
| Black | 48 | 38 | 14 |
| Hispanic | 74 | 21 | 5 |
| 18-29 | 62 | 26 | 12 |
| 30-39 | 67 | 23 | 10 |
| 40-49 | 57 | 34 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 57 | 31 | 12 |
| 65 and over | 63 | 31 | 6 |
| H.S. grad/less | 65 | 23 | 11 |
| Some college | 61 | 27 | 12 |
| College grad/more | 55 | 35 | 9 |
| Post grad | 50 | 42 | 7 |
| Democrat | 58 | 31 | 11 |
| Independent/other | 51 | 35 | 13 |
| Republican | 68 | 24 | 9 |
| Seattle | 49 | 44 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 54 | 28 | 18 |
| Chicago | 61 | 26 | 13 |
| San Antonio | 71 | 22 | 6 |
| Nashville | 69 | 20 | 11 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 73

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
## OTHER NATIONS WILL FEEL INSECURE AND BUILD NUCLEAR WEAPONS

| If we pull back, many nations would feel more insecure and would build their own nuclear weapons | Convincing Argument<br>% | Not Convincing<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 66 | 22 | 13 |
| Male | 66 | 21 | 12 |
| Female | 65 | 22 | 13 |
| White | 66 | 21 | 13 |
| Black | 64 | 24 | 12 |
| Hispanic | 64 | 31 | 5 |
| 18-29 | 71 | 16 | 14 |
| 30-39 | 69 | 24 | 7 |
| 40-49 | 63 | 22 | 16 |
| 50-64 | 63 | 25 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 59 | 30 | 11 |
| H.S. grad/less | 64 | 21 | 15 |
| Some college | 65 | 23 | 13 |
| College grad | 68 | 22 | 9 |
| Post grad | 67 | 23 | 10 |
| Democrat | 65 | 22 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 60 | 26 | 14 |
| Republican | 69 | 21 | 10 |
| Seattle | 56 | 30 | 15 |
| Baltimore | 69 | 18 | 14 |
| Chicago | 68 | 21 | 14 |
| San Antonio | 70 | 22 | 8 |
| Nashville | 68 | 19 | 13 |

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

## TABLE 74

## OVERALL REACTION TO FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

| Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about Future Four | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 14 | 15 | 23 | 42 | 7 |
| Male | 15 | 15 | 19 | 46 | 5 |
| Female | 13 | 15 | 26 | 38 | 8 |
| White | 12 | 13 | 23 | 46 | 7 |
| Black | 20 | 27 | 22 | 25 | 7 |
| Hispanics | 21 | 9 | 30 | 37 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 12 | 15 | 28 | 40 | 5 |
| 30-39 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 50 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 11 | 13 | 25 | 46 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 17 | 23 | 40 | 8 |
| 65 and over | 23 | 10 | 21 | 35 | 10 |
| H.S. grad/less | 19 | 17 | 23 | 33 | 8 |
| Some college | 12 | 13 | 20 | 50 | 6 |
| College grad/more | 6 | 14 | 26 | 50 | 3 |
| Post grad | 8 | 13 | 29 | 43 | 7 |
| Democrat | 16 | 15 | 24 | 38 | 7 |
| Independent/other | 9 | 18 | 30 | 37 | 7 |
| Republican | 12 | 12 | 20 | 51 | 5 |
| Seattle | 11 | 19 | 22 | 43 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 17 | 16 | 29 | 33 | 5 |
| Chicago | 19 | 14 | 21 | 38 | 8 |
| San Antonio | 14 | 10 | 25 | 48 | 4 |
| Nashville | 10 | 15 | 18 | 47 | 10 |

"Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North American. Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves.

PRO: We will be able to concentrate on our own problems here in the U.S.
CON: If we pull back, we will have to stand alone in a hostile world."

## TABLE 75

## OVERALL VIEW OF THE FOUR FUTURES: FUTURES RANKED FIRST OR SECOND IN PREFERENCE

| Futures ranked first or second in preference | FUTURE ONE<br>% | FUTURE TWO<br>% | FUTURE THREE<br>% | FUTURE FOUR<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 39 | 75 | 76 | 12 |
| Male | 37 | 77 | 76 | 12 |
| Female | 41 | 72 | 77 | 12 |
| White | 39 | 76 | 76 | 11 |
| Black | 34 | 65 | 87 | 19 |
| Hispanic | 55 | 72 | 70 | 6 |
| 18-29 | 35 | 71 | 79 | 16 |
| 30-39 | 36 | 78 | 79 | 10 |
| 40-49 | 38 | 73 | 80 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 48 | 79 | 68 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 42 | 76 | 73 | 13 |
| Less than high school | 47 | 70 | 72 | 16 |
| High school graduate | 37 | 73 | 81 | 11 |
| Some college | 30 | 84 | 79 | 7 |
| College grad/more | 37 | 88 | 76 | 8 |
| Democrat | 36 | 75 | 79 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 31 | 75 | 85 | 12 |
| Republican | 46 | 76 | 71 | 10 |
| Seattle | 20 | 78 | 90 | 13 |
| Baltimore | 35 | 71 | 84 | 13 |
| Chicago | 43 | 79 | 72 | 10 |
| San Antonio | 56 | 76 | 62 | 9 |
| Nashville | 44 | 69 | 74 | 16 |

"Rank the four Futures in the order you favor them. Rank them by giving a "1" to the Future you favor most, a "2" to your second choice, a "3" to your third choice, and a "4" to the Future you favor least."

## TABLE 76

## OVERALL VIEW OF THE FOUR FUTURES: FUTURES NOT SELECTED BECAUSE THEY ARE BELIEVED NOT POSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE

| Is there any Future you favor but did not select because you think it's not possible to achieve? | FUTURE ONE % | FUTURE TWO % | FUTURE THREE % | FUTURE FOUR % | All are Possible % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 16 | 18 | 25 | 13 | 35 |
| Male | 19 | 16 | 23 | 13 | 36 |
| Female | 12 | 19 | 28 | 14 | 34 |
| White | 14 | 18 | 25 | 13 | 37 |
| Black | 17 | 14 | 32 | 14 | 29 |
| Hispanics | 26 | 15 | 24 | 7 | 29 |
| 18-29 | 17 | 20 | 21 | 7 | 38 |
| 30-39 | 7 | 16 | 30 | 16 | 36 |
| 40-49 | 14 | 11 | 24 | 16 | 39 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 20 | 30 | 16 | 24 |
| 65 and over | 20 | 20 | 22 | 13 | 33 |
| H.S. grad/less | 21 | 17 | 24 | 15 | 31 |
| Some college | 13 | 19 | 27 | 13 | 35 |
| College grad | 9 | 20 | 24 | 10 | 42 |
| Post grad | 15 | 12 | 29 | 9 | 40 |
| Democrat | 16 | 15 | 22 | 13 | 38 |
| Independent/other | 11 | 11 | 26 | 12 | 44 |
| Republican | 17 | 23 | 30 | 13 | 26 |
| Seattle | 8 | 15 | 22 | 8 | 53 |
| Baltimore | 19 | 16 | 31 | 16 | 29 |
| Chicago | 15 | 17 | 28 | 15 | 32 |
| San Antonio | 21 | 25 | 21 | 9 | 29 |
| Nashville | 15 | 16 | 24 | 18 | 33 |

## TABLE 77

### OVERALL VIEW OF THE FOUR FUTURES: WHICH FUTURE IS MOST LIKELY TO OCCUR BY 2010, REGARDLESS OF PREFERENCE

| Regardless of which Future you prefer, which one do you think is most likely to occur by the year 2010 | FUTURE ONE % | FUTURE TWO % | FUTURE THREE % | FUTURE FOUR % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 22 | 31 | 31 | 3 | 14 |
| Male | 22 | 33 | 31 | 4 | 9 |
| Female | 21 | 29 | 30 | 3 | 18 |
| White | 20 | 32 | 32 | 3 | 14 |
| Black | 19 | 22 | 36 | 5 | 18 |
| Hispanics | 37 | 34 | 19 | -- | 10 |
| 18-29 | 22 | 30 | 30 | 3 | 15 |
| 30-39 | 25 | 34 | 26 | 1 | 15 |
| 40-49 | 24 | 30 | 37 | 2 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 18 | 35 | 28 | 6 | 14 |
| 65 and over | 19 | 27 | 36 | 5 | 14 |
| H.S. grad/less | 21 | 25 | 32 | 6 | 16 |
| Some college | 23 | 31 | 34 | 1 | 12 |
| College grad | 17 | 40 | 30 | 3 | 11 |
| Post grad | 24 | 38 | 23 | 4 | 12 |
| Democrat | 20 | 25 | 39 | 4 | 12 |
| Independent/other | 16 | 39 | 26 | 1 | 19 |
| Republican | 24 | 34 | 25 | 3 | 14 |
| Seattle | 16 | 38 | 34 | 5 | 8 |
| Baltimore | 20 | 20 | 40 | 4 | 17 |
| Chicago | 21 | 35 | 25 | 4 | 14 |
| San Antonio | 27 | 32 | 25 | 1 | 15 |
| Nashville | 24 | 30 | 29 | 3 | 15 |

## TABLE 78

## EVALUATION OF INFORMATION PRESENTED IN LABS: MORE OR LESS THOUGHT-PROVOKING THAN TV OR NEWSPAPER NEWS

| How would you compare the information tonight to information from TV news. Was is more thought-provoking, less, or the same as TV or newspaper news | More than TV<br>% | Less than TV<br>% | Same as TV<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 76 | 4 | 16 | 4 |
| Male | 73 | 5 | 17 | 5 |
| Female | 79 | 2 | 15 | 4 |
| White | 79 | 3 | 15 | 4 |
| Black | 64 | 8 | 19 | 9 |
| Hispanic | 68 | 4 | 26 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 75 | 6 | 15 | 4 |
| 30-39 | 72 | 5 | 20 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 75 | 3 | 18 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 80 | 2 | 12 | 6 |
| 65 and over | 83 | 2 | 13 | 1 |
| H.S. grad/less | 75 | 5 | 13 | 7 |
| Some college | 77 | 3 | 17 | 3 |
| College grad | 75 | 5 | 20 | 1 |
| Post grad | 82 | 2 | 14 | 2 |
| Democrat | 74 | 4 | 18 | 5 |
| Independent/other | 80 | 3 | 16 | 2 |
| Republican | 79 | 4 | 13 | 3 |
| Seattle | 78 | 3 | 16 | 3 |
| Baltimore | 71 | 4 | 17 | 7 |
| Chicago | 75 | 6 | 16 | 3 |
| San Antonio | 77 | 2 | 18 | 4 |
| Nashville | 79 | 3 | 14 | 5 |

"How would you compare the presentation tonight to what you normally get through TV news and in the newspaper. Would you say the presentation tonight was more thought-provoking, less thought-provoking, or about the same?"

## TABLE 79

## EVALUATION OF INFORMATION PRESENTED IN LABS: MORE OR LESS UNDERSTANDABLE THAN TV OR NEWSPAPER NEWS

| How would you compare the information tonight to information from TV news. Was is more understandable, less, or the same as TV or newspaper news. | More than TV % | Less than TV % | Same as TV % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 76 | 4 | 16 | 4 |
| Male | 73 | 5 | 17 | 5 |
| Female | 79 | 2 | 15 | 4 |
| White | 79 | 3 | 15 | 4 |
| Black | 64 | 8 | 19 | 9 |
| Hispanic | 68 | 4 | 26 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 75 | 6 | 15 | 4 |
| 30-39 | 72 | 5 | 20 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 75 | 3 | 18 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 80 | 2 | 12 | 6 |
| 65 and over | 83 | 2 | 13 | 1 |
| H.S. grad/less | 75 | 5 | 13 | 7 |
| Some college | 77 | 3 | 17 | 3 |
| College grad | 75 | 5 | 20 | 1 |
| Post grad | 82 | 2 | 14 | 2 |
| Democrat | 74 | 4 | 18 | 5 |
| Independent/other | 80 | 3 | 16 | 2 |
| Republican | 79 | 4 | 13 | 3 |
| Seattle | 78 | 3 | 16 | 3 |
| Baltimore | 71 | 4 | 17 | 7 |
| Chicago | 75 | 6 | 16 | 3 |
| San Antonio | 77 | 2 | 18 | 4 |
| Nashville | 79 | 3 | 14 | 5 |

"How would you compare the presentation tonight to what you normally get through TV news and in the newspaper. Would you say the presentation tonight was more understandable, less understandable, of about the same?"

## TABLE 80

## OVERALL CHANGE OF MIND ABOUT ANY ASPECT OF THE ISSUES

| Did you change your mind about any aspect of this issue or think about the the issue in ways you had not previously considered | Yes<br>% | No<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 41 | 40 | 19 |
| | | | |
| Male | 34 | 51 | 16 |
| Female | 49 | 30 | 21 |
| | | | |
| White | 40 | 41 | 19 |
| Black | 45 | 42 | 13 |
| Hispanic | 39 | 41 | 20 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 43 | 37 | 20 |
| 30-39 | 45 | 38 | 16 |
| 40-49 | 43 | 47 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 38 | 34 | 28 |
| 65 and over | 33 | 52 | 16 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 37 | 36 | 26 |
| Some college | 38 | 44 | 18 |
| College grad | 48 | 45 | 7 |
| Post grad | 48 | 42 | 10 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 45 | 38 | 17 |
| Independent/other | 38 | 41 | 21 |
| Republican | 38 | 45 | 17 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 43 | 40 | 17 |
| Baltimore | 43 | 41 | 17 |
| Chicago | 43 | 42 | 16 |
| San Antonio | 36 | 40 | 24 |
| Nashville | 43 | 39 | 18 |

## TABLE 81

## AWARENESS OF PUBLIC SUMMIT 88

| Have you heard of Public Summit 88 | Yes<br>% | No<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 10 | 78 | 13 |
| | | | |
| Male | 8 | 84 | 8 |
| Female | 12 | 72 | 17 |
| | | | |
| White | 10 | 78 | 12 |
| Black | 7 | 79 | 13 |
| Hispanic | 8 | 75 | 17 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 10 | 76 | 15 |
| 30-39 | 9 | 80 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 9 | 78 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 78 | 11 |
| 65 and over | 8 | 80 | 13 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 7 | 79 | 14 |
| Some college | 8 | 79 | 13 |
| College grad/more | 13 | 76 | 11 |
| Post grad | 23 | 72 | 5 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 9 | 78 | 14 |
| Independent/other | 14 | 75 | 12 |
| Republican | 9 | 80 | 12 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 19 | 75 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 7 | 79 | 15 |
| Chicago | 2 | 82 | 16 |
| San Antonio | 9 | 80 | 11 |
| Nashville | 11 | 73 | 17 |

# II. COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POSTTEST RESULTS

## TABLE 1

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: POSTTEST SUMMARY TABLE

| Possible Threats | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Soviet Union attacking other nations | 27 | 39 | 26 | 8 |
| The Soviet Union will launch an all nuclear attack on the U.S. | 8 | 12 | 75 | 5 |
| The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war | 13 | 29 | 51 | 7 |
| Damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries | 30 | 44 | 22 | 4 |
| We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak position | 9 | 20 | 65 | 7 |
| Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems like terrorism | 32 | 42 | 22 | 5 |
| A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into all-out war | 14 | 39 | 38 | 8 |
| We will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam | 13 | 35 | 43 | 9 |
| Marxism/communist will spread to more and more countries around the world | 16 | 39 | 33 | 12 |
| The Soviets will increase their support of terrorists and countries like Lybia | 22 | 47 | 22 | 9 |
| A country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will use nuclear weapons | 18 | 43 | 31 | 9 |
| Poor communications will cause a conflict to become a crisis that threatens war | 18 | 45 | 30 | 6 |
| We will neglect problems in the U.S. because of arms-race spending | 29 | 43 | 25 | 3 |
| A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by computer | 8 | 18 | 64 | 10 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 2

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: PRETEST SUMMARY TABLE:

| Possible Threats | Very Likely % | Fairly Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Soviet Union attacking other nations | 30 | 39 | 22 | 9 |
| The Soviet Union will launch an all nuclear attack on the U.S. | 9 | 18 | 65 | 8 |
| The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war | 17 | 27 | 42 | 14 |
| Damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries | 36 | 37 | 20 | 8 |
| We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak position | 11 | 21 | 57 | 10 |
| Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems like terrorism | 26 | 46 | 20 | 8 |
| A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into all-out war | 17 | 34 | 35 | 14 |
| We will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam | 17 | 36 | 40 | 8 |
| Marxism/communist will spread to more and more countries around the world | 17 | 43 | 28 | 12 |
| The Soviets will increase their support of terrorists and countries like Lybia | 21 | 46 | 20 | 14 |
| A country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will use nuclear weapons | 20 | 41 | 28 | 10 |
| Poor communications will cause a conflict to become a crisis that threatens war | 21 | 46 | 25 | 8 |
| We will neglect problems in the U.S. because of arms-race spending | 33 | 36 | 26 | 4 |
| A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by computer | 11 | 22 | 54 | 14 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 3

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY:
## SOVIET UNION ATTACKING OTHER NATIONS (SUCH AS AFGHANISTAN)

| The Soviet Union will attack other nations in the way they invaded Afghanistan | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 27 | 30 |
| Fairly likely | 39 | 39 |
| Not that likely | 26 | 22 |
| Not sure | 8 | 9 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

# TABLE 4

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: SOVIET UNION LAUNCHING ALL OUT NUCLEAR ATTACK ON U.S.

| Sooner or later, the Soviet Union will launch an all out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S. | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 8 | 9 |
| Fairly likely | 12 | 18 |
| Not that likely | 75 | 65 |
| Not sure | 5 | 8 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 5

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: THE ARMS RACE WILL LEAD TO NUCLEAR WAR

| The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 13 | 17 |
| Fairly likely | 29 | 27 |
| Not that likely | 51 | 42 |
| Not sure | 7 | 14 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 6

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: DAMAGE TO OUR ECONOMY FROM DEFENDING OTHER COUNTRIES

| We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 30 | 36 |
| Fairly likely | 44 | 37 |
| Not that likely | 22 | 20 |
| Not sure | 4 | 8 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 7

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY:
## SIGNING AN ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT THAT WILL LEAVE US WEAK OR INFERIOR

| We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 9 | 11 |
| Fairly likely | 20 | 21 |
| Not that likely | 65 | 57 |
| Not sure | 7 | 10 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 8

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: MISTRUST WILL KEEP US FROM WORKING WITH THE SOVIETS AGAINST REAL PROBLEMS

| Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 32 | 26 |
| Fairly likely | 42 | 46 |
| Not that likely | 22 | 20 |
| Not sure | 5 | 8 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 9

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: A REGIONAL WAR WILL ESCALATE INTO ALL OUT WAR

| A regional war (like the Middle East) will escalate into all out war | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 14 | 17 |
| Fairly likely | 39 | 34 |
| Not that likely | 38 | 35 |
| Not sure | 8 | 14 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 10

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: THE U.S. WILL GET BOGGED DOWN IN ANOTHER VIETNAM

| The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 13 | 17 |
| Fairly likely | 35 | 36 |
| Not that likely | 43 | 40 |
| Not sure | 9 | 8 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 11

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: MARXISM AND COMMUNISM WILL SPREAD

| Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 16 | 17 |
| Fairly likely | 39 | 43 |
| Not that likely | 33 | 28 |
| Not sure | 12 | 12 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 12

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY:
## SOVIETS WILL INCREASE SUPPORT OF LYBIA AND OTHER TERRORISTS

| The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Lybia and terrorist groups in the Middle East | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Very likely | 22 | 21 |
| Fairly likely | 47 | 46 |
| Not that likely | 22 | 20 |
| Not sure | 9 | 14 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 13

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: A SMALLER COUNTRY WILL EVENTUALLY USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

| A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 18 | 20 |
| Fairly likely | 43 | 41 |
| Not that likely | 31 | 28 |
| Not sure | 9 | 10 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 14

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: POOR COMMUNICATION WILL CAUSE AN INCIDENT TO BECOME A CRISIS THAT THREATENS WAR

| Poor communication will cause a conflict or an incident (like the downing of the Korean airlines) to become a crisis that threatens war | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 18 | 21 |
| Fairly likely | 45 | 46 |
| Not that likely | 30 | 25 |
| Not sure | 6 | 8 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 15

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: WE WILL NEGLECT PROBLEMS HERE BECAUSE OF SPENDING ON THE ARMS-RACE

| We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 29 | 33 |
| Fairly likely | 43 | 36 |
| Not that likely | 25 | 26 |
| Not sure | 3 | 4 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 16

## LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: A NUCLEAR WEAPON WILL BE ACCIDENTALLY LAUNCHED BY A COMPUTER

| A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally by a computer | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Very likely | 8 | 11 |
| Fairly likely | 18 | 22 |
| Not that likely | 64 | 54 |
| Not sure | 10 | 14 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 17-1

## SUPPORT FOR THE FOUR FUTURES
## FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND

| Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Strongly favor | 26 | 32 |
| Somewhat favor | 23 | 39 |
| Somewhat oppose | 17 | 11 |
| Strongly oppose | 24 | 9 |
| Not sure | 10 | 9 |

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

POSTTEST PRO'S AND CON'S:
PRO: History proves that strength is the only thing the Russians respect.
CON: Risky: will make the Soviets feel as if they are backed into a corner."

## TABLE 17-2

## SUPPORT FOR THE FOUR FUTURES
## FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT

| Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world) | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 21 | 64 |
| Somewhat favor | 34 | 25 |
| Somewhat oppose | 21 | 6 |
| Strongly oppose | 13 | 3 |
| Not sure | 11 | 3 |

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

POSTTEST PRO'S AND CON'S:
PRO: The way things are going now, it's only a matter of time before a nuclear war.
CON: The Soviets can't be trusted to keep such agreements."

## TABLE 17-3

## SUPPORT FOR THE FOUR FUTURES
## FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

| Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons around the world | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Strongly favor | 39 | 77 |
| Somewhat favor | 31 | 16 |
| Somewhat oppose | 13 | 3 |
| Strongly oppose | 8 | 3 |
| Not sure | 9 | 2 |

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

POSTTEST PRO'S AND CON'S:
PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to build trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us."

## TABLE 17-4

## SUPPORT FOR THE FOUR FUTURES
## FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

| Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 14 | 13 |
| Somewhat favor | 15 | 20 |
| Somewhat oppose | 23 | 25 |
| Strongly oppose | 42 | 36 |
| Not sure | 7 | 6 |

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

POSTTEST PRO'S AND CON'S:
PRO: We will be able to concentrate on our own problems here in the U.S.
CON: If we pull back, we will have to stand alone in a hostile world."

## TABLE 18

## STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WANTS TO WORK WITH US TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS

| The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Agree | 55 | 45 |
| Disagree | 24 | 28 |
| Not sure | 21 | 27 |

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 19

## STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY WANT TO REDUCE THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR AS MUCH AS WE DO

| Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war as much as we do | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Agree | 82 | 76 |
| Disagree | 9 | 12 |
| Not sure | 9 | 12 |

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 20

## STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WANT THE WORLD TO BE COMMUNIST AND WILL NOT STOP TRYING TO REACH THAT GOAL

| No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Agree | 53 | 51 |
| Disagree | 27 | 24 |
| Not sure | 21 | 25 |

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 21

## STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION:
## HAVE SO MANY PROBLEMS THEY DO NOT POSE MUCH OF A THREAT

| The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S. | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Agree | 17 | 14 |
| Disagree | 72 | 75 |
| Not sure | 12 | 11 |

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

# TABLE 22

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BUILD STAR WARS

| We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called SDI or "Star Wars") | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 26 | 27 |
| Somewhat favor | 30 | 28 |
| Somewhat oppose | 20 | 16 |
| Strongly oppose | 19 | 19 |
| Not sure | 6 | 11 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means giving up the chance to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear arms with the Soviets.'"

## TABLE 23

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: AID ANTICOMMUNIST GROUPS IN THE THIRD WORLD

| We should aid anticommunist groups and governments in the Third World | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 10 | 18 |
| Somewhat favor | 29 | 45 |
| Somewhat oppose | 28 | 17 |
| Strongly oppose | 25 | 14 |
| Not sure | 8 | 7 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means sometimes supporting dictators and others who do not believe in democracy.'"

## TABLE 24

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: WORK WITH THE SOVIETS TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS

| We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Strongly favor | 28 | 70 |
| Somewhat favor | 31 | 25 |
| Somewhat oppose | 19 | 2 |
| Strongly oppose | 17 | 1 |
| Not sure | 6 | 2 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if the only way to gain their trust is by sharing or not building SDI or Star Wars.'"

# TABLE 25

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BRING OUR TROOPS HOME AND END TREATY COMMITMENTS

| We should work bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Strongly favor | 7 | 14 |
| Somewhat favor | 13 | 23 |
| Somewhat oppose | 28 | 28 |
| Strongly oppose | 49 | 28 |
| Not sure | 4 | 8 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means our allies might make concessions to the Soviets.'"

## TABLE 26

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: RECOGNIZE CUBA

| We should recognize Cuba and establish trade relations | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 10 | 11 |
| Somewhat favor | 26 | 30 |
| Somewhat oppose | 22 | 19 |
| Strongly oppose | 32 | 21 |
| Not sure | 10 | 19 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: '_even_ _if_ _that_ _means_ strengthening and legitimizing a communist government in this hemisphere.'"

## TABLE 27

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REACH AN AGREEMENT TO CUT BOTH SIDES' NUCLEAR ARSENALS

| We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 17 | 57 |
| Somewhat favor | 30 | 28 |
| Somewhat oppose | 19 | 6 |
| Strongly oppose | 28 | 4 |
| Not sure | 6 | 5 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means leaving them with the largest army in the world.'"

## TABLE 28

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REFUSE TO WORK WITH SOVIETS UNTIL THEY SHOW GREATER RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

| We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Strongly favor | 12 | 12 |
| Somewhat favor | 24 | 27 |
| Somewhat oppose | 35 | 33 |
| Strongly oppose | 23 | 22 |
| Not sure | 5 | 7 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means not signing any arms control agreement.'"

## TABLE 29

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: PROVIDE INCREASED MILITARY AID TO THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES TO HELP THEM FIGHT COMMUNISM

| We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Strongly favor | 13 | 13 |
| Somewhat favor | 31 | 33 |
| Somewhat oppose | 30 | 28 |
| Strongly oppose | 21 | 17 |
| Not sure | 6 | 9 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means increasing the chance that U.S. troops will get involved in local fighting.'"

## TABLE 30

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: A JOINT U.S.-SOVIET MANNED MISSION TO MARS

| We and the Soviets should work together on a joint manned mission to the planet Mars | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Strongly favor | 21 | 22 |
| Somewhat favor | 29 | 29 |
| Somewhat oppose | 21 | 15 |
| Strongly oppose | 22 | 18 |
| Not sure | 7 | 16 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means sharing our high technology.'"

## TABLE 31

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: MAKE OUR ALLIES PAY MORE OF THE COST OF THEIR DEFENSE

| We should make our allies (like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 37 | 55 |
| Somewhat favor | 41 | 28 |
| Somewhat oppose | 11 | 5 |
| Strongly oppose | 4 | 3 |
| Not sure | 7 | 9 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues.'"

## TABLE 32

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: NEGOTIATE AGREEMENTS WITH THE SOVIETS TO PREVENT REGIONAL CRISES FROM ESCALATING INTO GLOBAL WAR

| We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 28 | 67 |
| Somewhat favor | 42 | 24 |
| Somewhat oppose | 13 | 3 |
| Strongly oppose | 7 | 2 |
| Not sure | 11 | 4 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means doing things that our allies such as Israel oppose.'"

## TABLE 33

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REACH AN AGREEMENT TO CUT BOTH SIDES' NUCLEAR ARSENALS

| We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Strongly favor | 37 | 57 |
| Somewhat favor | 37 | 28 |
| Somewhat oppose | 12 | 6 |
| Strongly oppose | 8 | 4 |
| Not sure | 6 | 5 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means increasing our nonnuclear, conventional (army, navy, etc.) so that it matches theirs.'"

## TABLE 34

## POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: STOP DEFENDING OTHER COUNTRIES AND JUST DEFEND NORTH AMERICA

| We should stop defending countries around the world and defend only North America | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 4 | 8 |
| Somewhat favor | 8 | 21 |
| Somewhat oppose | 21 | 31 |
| Strongly oppose | 64 | 33 |
| Not sure | 3 | 8 |

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means we might eventually be surrounded by enemies.'"

## TABLE 35

## STATEMENT: THE SOVIETS TEST US AND ARE QUICK TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF WEAKNESS

| The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Agree | 71 | 68 |
| Disagree | 16 | 16 |
| Not sure | 13 | 16 |

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 36

## STATEMENT: WE SHOULD LIVE AND LET LIVE WITH COMMUNISM

| We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Agree | 49 | 50 |
| Disagree | 37 | 34 |
| Not sure | 14 | 17 |

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

# TABLE 37

## STATEMENT: THE SOVIET UNION IS AN EVIL EMPIRE

| The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany, an evil empire trying to rule the world | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Agree | 42 | 38 |
| Disagree | 39 | 42 |
| Not sure | 19 | 20 |

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 38

## STATEMENT: BECAUSE THE SOVIETS WILL CHEAT, WE SHOULD NOT SIGN ANY NUCLEAR ARMS AGREEMENTS

| Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms | POSTTEST<br>% | PRETEST<br>% |
|---|---|---|
| Agree | 24 | 24 |
| Disagree | 61 | 55 |
| Not sure | 15 | 21 |

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

# TABLE 39

## STATEMENT: THE U.S. WOULD BE SAFER IF WE LEARNED TO LIVE WITH THE SOVIETS THE WAY WE DO WITH CHINA AND YUGOSLAVIA

| The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Agree | 41 | 37 |
| Disagree | 43 | 45 |
| Not sure | 17 | 19 |

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 40

## STATEMENT: SOMEDAY THE U.S. WILL HAVE TO FIGHT THE SOVIET UNION TO STOP COMMUNISM

| When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism | POSTTEST | PRETEST |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| Agree | 23 | 26 |
| Disagree | 48 | 42 |
| Not sure | 29 | 33 |

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

# III. PRETEST SUMMARY TABLES

## TABLE 1

## REACTION TO FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND

| Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 32 | 39 | 11 | 9 | 9 |
| Male | 31 | 39 | 12 | 9 | 9 |
| Female | 34 | 38 | 10 | 8 | 9 |
| 18-29 | 26 | 38 | 17 | 10 | 10 |
| 30-39 | 31 | 37 | 9 | 12 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 36 | 42 | 9 | 8 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 39 | 41 | 6 | 5 | 8 |
| 65 and over | 32 | 41 | 11 | 8 | 9 |
| H.S. grad/less | 34 | 37 | 10 | 7 | 12 |
| Some college | 33 | 39 | 11 | 9 | 7 |
| College grad | 30 | 48 | 11 | 7 | 4 |
| Post grad | 26 | 39 | 12 | 15 | 9 |
| Democrat | 30 | 39 | 13 | 9 | 10 |
| Independent/other | 26 | 38 | 14 | 16 | 7 |
| Republican | 38 | 41 | 9 | 6 | 6 |
| Seattle | 22 | 34 | 17 | 21 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 31 | 42 | 9 | 6 | 12 |
| Chicago | 30 | 37 | 14 | 8 | 11 |
| San Antonio | 41 | 41 | 9 | 5 | 6 |
| Nashville | 39 | 41 | 7 | 4 | 9 |

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010."

## TABLE 2

## REACTION TO FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE

| Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time fight communist expansion in the Third World | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 64 | 25 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| | | | | | |
| Male | 62 | 26 | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| Female | 66 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| | | | | | |
| 18-29 | 56 | 31 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| 30-39 | 57 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| 40-49 | 66 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 76 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 65 and over | 71 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 |
| | | | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 65 | 21 | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| Some college | 67 | 25 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| College grad | 61 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 5 |
| Post grad | 55 | 36 | 7 | 2 | -- |
| | | | | | |
| Democrat | 63 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Independent/other | 62 | 24 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| Republican | 67 | 23 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| | | | | | |
| Seattle | 54 | 28 | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| Baltimore | 68 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Chicago | 63 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| San Antonio | 67 | 23 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| Nashville | 67 | 22 | 4 | 3 | 4 |

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010."

## TABLE 3

## REACTION TO FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

| Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 77 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Male | 79 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Female | 74 | 17 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 18-29 | 77 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 30-39 | 72 | 19 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 40-49 | 76 | 18 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 83 | 11 | -- | 4 | 2 |
| 65 and over | 75 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| H.S. grad/less | 75 | 14 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Some college | 78 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| College grad | 79 | 17 | 3 | 1 | -- |
| Post grad | 74 | 18 | 5 | 2 | -- |
| Democrat | 80 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Independent/other | 81 | 14 | 1 | 4 | -- |
| Republican | 74 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Seattle | 83 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Baltimore | 77 | 13 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Chicago | 75 | 17 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| San Antonio | 74 | 20 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Nashville | 74 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 2 |

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010."

## TABLE 4

## REACTION TO FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

| Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 13 | 20 | 25 | 36 | 6 |
| Male | 10 | 16 | 25 | 44 | 4 |
| Female | 16 | 23 | 25 | 27 | 8 |
| 18-29 | 8 | 20 | 24 | 41 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 9 | 16 | 27 | 41 | 7 |
| 40-49 | 10 | 16 | 32 | 38 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 18 | 23 | 22 | 32 | 6 |
| 65 and over | 22 | 21 | 26 | 25 | 7 |
| H.S. grad/less | 18 | 24 | 27 | 24 | 8 |
| Some college | 12 | 20 | 23 | 39 | 6 |
| College grad | 4 | 14 | 24 | 55 | 3 |
| Post grad | 8 | 8 | 37 | 44 | 3 |
| Democrat | 17 | 22 | 27 | 29 | 6 |
| Independent/other | 9 | 24 | 29 | 30 | 8 |
| Republican | 9 | 16 | 22 | 48 | 5 |
| Seattle | 15 | 19 | 24 | 36 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 12 | 28 | 26 | 24 | 10 |
| Chicago | 15 | 19 | 27 | 36 | 4 |
| San Antonio | 13 | 16 | 24 | 42 | 6 |
| Nashville | 11 | 17 | 25 | 39 | 8 |

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010."

# TABLE 5

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BUILD SDI OR "STAR WARS"

| We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called SDI or "Star Wars") | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 27 | 28 | 16 | 19 | 11 |
| | | | | | |
| Male | 38 | 28 | 11 | 18 | 6 |
| Female | 16 | 28 | 21 | 20 | 15 |
| | | | | | |
| 18-29 | 18 | 30 | 20 | 19 | 12 |
| 30-39 | 26 | 30 | 16 | 22 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 25 | 27 | 19 | 20 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 33 | 27 | 12 | 13 | 15 |
| 65 and over | 37 | 24 | 12 | 17 | 10 |
| | | | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 24 | 28 | 20 | 15 | 13 |
| Some college | 29 | 25 | 15 | 21 | 10 |
| College grad | 31 | 33 | 14 | 18 | 4 |
| Post grad | 21 | 34 | 11 | 25 | 9 |
| | | | | | |
| Democrat | 20 | 24 | 21 | 22 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 23 | 27 | 15 | 27 | 8 |
| Republican | 38 | 33 | 12 | 10 | 7 |
| | | | | | |
| Seattle | 26 | 25 | 12 | 30 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 24 | 28 | 23 | 14 | 11 |
| Chicago | 27 | 24 | 17 | 23 | 10 |
| San Antonio | 33 | 29 | 15 | 11 | 11 |
| Nashville | 24 | 35 | 13 | 15 | 14 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

# TABLE 6

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: PROVIDE AID TO ANTICOMMUNIST GROUPS AND GOVERNMENTS

| We should provide aid to anticommunist groups and governments | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 18 | 45 | 17 | 14 | 7 |
| Male | 20 | 46 | 16 | 12 | 6 |
| Female | 15 | 43 | 18 | 16 | 8 |
| 18-29 | 12 | 41 | 22 | 14 | 10 |
| 30-39 | 17 | 47 | 15 | 15 | 7 |
| 40-49 | 17 | 49 | 12 | 17 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 17 | 48 | 18 | 11 | 7 |
| 65 and over | 26 | 40 | 16 | 13 | 5 |
| H.S. grad/less | 14 | 42 | 19 | 18 | 7 |
| Some college | 16 | 47 | 14 | 13 | 10 |
| College grad | 25 | 43 | 20 | 7 | 5 |
| Post grad | 20 | 50 | 14 | 14 | 2 |
| Democrat | 12 | 45 | 18 | 16 | 9 |
| Independent/other | 11 | 49 | 14 | 20 | 7 |
| Republican | 27 | 46 | 15 | 9 | 5 |
| Seattle | 13 | 37 | 19 | 19 | 13 |
| Baltimore | 17 | 43 | 16 | 15 | 9 |
| Chicago | 16 | 46 | 18 | 15 | 5 |
| San Antonio | 23 | 47 | 15 | 9 | 6 |
| Nashville | 20 | 49 | 16 | 11 | 3 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 7

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: WORK WITH SOVIETS TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS

| We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 70 | 25 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Male | 74 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Female | 66 | 28 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-29 | 71 | 24 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 30-39 | 69 | 26 | 2 | -- | 3 |
| 40-49 | 71 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 66 | 30 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 65 and over | 71 | 23 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| H.S. grad/less | 64 | 28 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Some college | 73 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| College grad | 73 | 25 | 2 | -- | 1 |
| Post grad | 67 | 30 | 2 | 2 | -- |
| Democrat | 73 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Independent/other | 77 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Republican | 64 | 31 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Seattle | 73 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Baltimore | 71 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Chicago | 70 | 25 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| San Antonio | 67 | 26 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Nashville | 67 | 28 | 3 | -- | 2 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 8

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BRING OUR TROOPS HOME FROM OVERSEAS AND END TREATY COMMITMENTS

| We should bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 14 | 23 | 28 | 28 | 8 |
| Male | 11 | 21 | 30 | 33 | 5 |
| Female | 16 | 25 | 26 | 22 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 8 | 24 | 29 | 31 | 9 |
| 30-39 | 10 | 24 | 28 | 33 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 12 | 22 | 31 | 29 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 21 | 32 | 24 | 7 |
| 65 and over | 25 | 20 | 23 | 20 | 13 |
| H.S. grad/less | 20 | 24 | 29 | 18 | 10 |
| Some college | 11 | 25 | 25 | 32 | 8 |
| College grad | 5 | 19 | 31 | 40 | 5 |
| Post grad | 9 | 14 | 38 | 36 | 4 |
| Democrat | 18 | 24 | 29 | 23 | 7 |
| Independent/other | 13 | 32 | 24 | 23 | 7 |
| Republican | 7 | 19 | 32 | 37 | 6 |
| Seattle | 15 | 21 | 29 | 25 | 10 |
| Baltimore | 19 | 27 | 29 | 18 | 7 |
| Chicago | 16 | 24 | 26 | 27 | 7 |
| San Antonio | 11 | 23 | 26 | 35 | 5 |
| Nashville | 7 | 20 | 30 | 34 | 10 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 9

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: RECOGNIZE AND ESTABLISH TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA

| We should recognize and establish trade relations with Cuba | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 11 | 30 | 19 | 21 | 19 |
| Male | 16 | 33 | 17 | 21 | 13 |
| Female | 6 | 27 | 21 | 21 | 25 |
| 18-29 | 8 | 26 | 18 | 18 | 29 |
| 30-39 | 12 | 35 | 17 | 14 | 21 |
| 40-49 | 10 | 28 | 19 | 26 | 17 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 29 | 20 | 28 | 15 |
| 65 and over | 18 | 30 | 22 | 21 | 10 |
| H.S. grad/less | 7 | 24 | 18 | 27 | 23 |
| Some college | 12 | 31 | 20 | 19 | 20 |
| College grad | 14 | 35 | 22 | 16 | 13 |
| Post grad | 13 | 37 | 17 | 18 | 15 |
| Democrat | 12 | 34 | 16 | 19 | 19 |
| Independent/other | 16 | 25 | 17 | 20 | 23 |
| Republican | 8 | 27 | 24 | 24 | 17 |
| Seattle | 21 | 31 | 15 | 17 | 16 |
| Baltimore | 10 | 33 | 11 | 24 | 22 |
| Chicago | 11 | 29 | 18 | 22 | 20 |
| San Antonio | 6 | 27 | 28 | 24 | 15 |
| Nashville | 6 | 30 | 23 | 18 | 23 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 10

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REACH AN AGREEMENT TO CUT BOTH SIDES' NUCLEAR ARSENALS DRASTICALLY

| We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 57 | 28 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| Male | 65 | 23 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Female | 50 | 32 | 6 | 3 | 8 |
| 18-29 | 54 | 30 | 8 | 4 | 5 |
| 30-39 | 63 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 55 | 32 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 53 | 32 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| 65 and over | 63 | 24 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| H.S. grad/less | 52 | 34 | 5 | 4 | 6 |
| Some college | 64 | 23 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| College grad | 60 | 25 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| Post grad | 50 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 3 |
| Democrat | 61 | 26 | 5 | 2 | 6 |
| Independent/other | 60 | 31 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Republican | 53 | 29 | 8 | 5 | 4 |
| Seattle | 64 | 24 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Baltimore | 60 | 26 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| Chicago | 57 | 32 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| San Antonio | 51 | 32 | 9 | 6 | 2 |
| Nashville | 54 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 10 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 11

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REFUSE TO WORK WITH SOVIETS UNTIL THEY SHOW RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

| We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 12 | 27 | 33 | 22 | 7 |
| Male | 14 | 26 | 33 | 23 | 5 |
| Female | 10 | 27 | 32 | 22 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 8 | 26 | 32 | 23 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 10 | 27 | 36 | 23 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 9 | 23 | 38 | 27 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 13 | 28 | 33 | 17 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 15 | 32 | 26 | 19 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 12 | 31 | 31 | 17 | 9 |
| Some college | 11 | 26 | 34 | 23 | 6 |
| College grad | 9 | 20 | 34 | 31 | 6 |
| Post grad | 6 | 25 | 39 | 25 | 4 |
| Democrat | 12 | 27 | 32 | 22 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 14 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 6 |
| Republican | 9 | 27 | 38 | 21 | 6 |
| Seattle | 6 | 21 | 37 | 30 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 17 | 26 | 28 | 23 | 7 |
| Chicago | 9 | 28 | 36 | 22 | 6 |
| San Antonio | 13 | 32 | 33 | 18 | 5 |
| Nashville | 13 | 25 | 31 | 19 | 12 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 12

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: PROVIDE INCREASED MILITARY AID TO THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

| We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 13 | 33 | 28 | 17 | 9 |
| Male | 15 | 33 | 29 | 16 | 7 |
| Female | 11 | 34 | 27 | 18 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 10 | 32 | 31 | 17 | 10 |
| 30-39 | 13 | 35 | 25 | 17 | 10 |
| 40-49 | 13 | 36 | 22 | 21 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 31 | 36 | 15 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 17 | 33 | 28 | 16 | 6 |
| H.S. grad/less | 11 | 35 | 28 | 15 | 11 |
| Some college | 15 | 31 | 30 | 18 | 7 |
| College grad | 14 | 31 | 29 | 19 | 6 |
| Post grad | 7 | 41 | 24 | 19 | 8 |
| Democrat | 10 | 33 | 30 | 19 | 9 |
| Independent/other | 11 | 29 | 29 | 20 | 10 |
| Republican | 15 | 39 | 27 | 13 | 6 |
| Seattle | 8 | 24 | 33 | 28 | 8 |
| Baltimore | 13 | 32 | 31 | 14 | 11 |
| Chicago | 13 | 33 | 33 | 15 | 7 |
| San Antonio | 16 | 40 | 22 | 14 | 8 |
| Nashville | 16 | 39 | 23 | 14 | 9 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

# TABLE 13

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: MANNED MISSION TO MARS WITH SOVIETS

| We and the Soviets should work together on a joint, manned mission to the planet Mars | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 22 | 29 | 15 | 18 | 16 |
| Male | 29 | 32 | 12 | 16 | 12 |
| Female | 17 | 27 | 18 | 19 | 19 |
| 18-29 | 18 | 28 | 9 | 22 | 23 |
| 30-39 | 27 | 26 | 16 | 19 | 12 |
| 40-49 | 19 | 24 | 17 | 25 | 14 |
| 50-64 | 18 | 38 | 20 | 11 | 14 |
| 65 and over | 34 | 28 | 19 | 8 | 11 |
| H.S. grad/less | 18 | 23 | 19 | 22 | 19 |
| Some college | 26 | 30 | 13 | 17 | 15 |
| College grad | 24 | 34 | 15 | 16 | 11 |
| Post grad | 24 | 37 | 15 | 14 | 10 |
| Democrat | 23 | 30 | 13 | 20 | 14 |
| Independent/other | 27 | 31 | 12 | 14 | 17 |
| Republican | 21 | 30 | 18 | 16 | 15 |
| Seattle | 34 | 31 | 14 | 12 | 10 |
| Baltimore | 24 | 30 | 12 | 20 | 13 |
| Chicago | 19 | 31 | 15 | 16 | 19 |
| San Antonio | 18 | 30 | 18 | 19 | 14 |
| Nashville | 16 | 24 | 15 | 23 | 21 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 14

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: MAKE OUR ALLIES (LIKE JAPAN AND GERMANY) PAY MORE OF THE COST OF THEIR DEFENSE

| We should make our allies (like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 55 | 28 | 5 | 3 | 9 |
| Male | 61 | 25 | 5 | 3 | 6 |
| Female | 50 | 32 | 5 | 2 | 11 |
| 18-29 | 34 | 33 | 9 | 4 | 19 |
| 30-39 | 49 | 35 | 7 | 3 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 59 | 31 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 71 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 65 and over | 74 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| H.S. grad/less | 48 | 31 | 6 | 3 | 12 |
| Some college | 57 | 27 | 6 | 3 | 8 |
| College grad | 62 | 31 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Post grad | 62 | 30 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Democrat | 53 | 30 | 5 | 3 | 9 |
| Independent/other | 46 | 37 | 6 | 3 | 8 |
| Republican | 64 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Seattle | 58 | 30 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 57 | 22 | 8 | 4 | 8 |
| Chicago | 52 | 27 | 5 | 2 | 13 |
| San Antonio | 59 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 8 |
| Nashville | 50 | 37 | 3 | 3 | 8 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 15

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: NEGOTIATE AGREEMENTS WITH THE SOVIETS TO PREVENT LOCAL CRISES FROM ESCALATING INTO GLOBAL WAR

| We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war | Strongly Favor % | Somewhat Favor % | Somewhat Oppose % | Strongly Oppose % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 67 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| | | | | | |
| Male | 72 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Female | 63 | 26 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| | | | | | |
| 18-29 | 63 | 29 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 30-39 | 66 | 26 | 5 | -- | 4 |
| 40-49 | 71 | 18 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 71 | 22 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 65 and over | 72 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| | | | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 64 | 22 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| Some college | 68 | 26 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| College grad | 74 | 23 | 2 | -- | 2 |
| Post grad | 72 | 21 | 7 | -- | -- |
| | | | | | |
| Democrat | 69 | 23 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Independent/other | 66 | 26 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Republican | 69 | 23 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| | | | | | |
| Seattle | 76 | 18 | 3 | -- | 3 |
| Baltimore | 58 | 31 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Chicago | 73 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| San Antonio | 61 | 28 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| Nashville | 66 | 25 | 2 | 2 | 6 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 16

### REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: INCREASE OUR NONNUCLEAR STRENGTH TO EQUAL SOVIETS

| We should increase our nonnuclear, conventional military strength (army, navy, etc.) so that it matches the level of the Soviet Union | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 44 | 32 | 12 | 6 | 6 |
| Male | 37 | 35 | 15 | 7 | 5 |
| Female | 51 | 28 | 9 | 6 | 6 |
| 18-29 | 38 | 35 | 16 | 6 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 45 | 25 | 17 | 8 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 40 | 35 | 11 | 7 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 49 | 35 | 8 | 3 | 6 |
| 65 and over | 48 | 30 | 10 | 9 | 3 |
| H.S. grad/less | 50 | 29 | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| Some college | 42 | 31 | 16 | 7 | 5 |
| College grad | 32 | 42 | 13 | 7 | 6 |
| Post grad | 37 | 37 | 19 | 3 | 4 |
| Democrat | 43 | 33 | 12 | 7 | 4 |
| Independent/other | 31 | 39 | 12 | 9 | 9 |
| Republican | 49 | 28 | 13 | 5 | 5 |
| Seattle | 32 | 35 | 14 | 11 | 9 |
| Baltimore | 42 | 35 | 11 | 8 | 4 |
| Chicago | 40 | 39 | 11 | 5 | 5 |
| San Antonio | 54 | 36 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
| Nashville | 54 | 24 | 12 | 4 | 7 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 17

## REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: STOP DEFENDING COUNTRIES AROUND THE WORLD AND DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

| We should stop defending other countries around the world and defend only North America | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 8 | 21 | 31 | 33 | 8 |
| Male | 7 | 17 | 34 | 37 | 5 |
| Female | 8 | 24 | 29 | 29 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 5 | 20 | 35 | 32 | 9 |
| 30-39 | 5 | 16 | 38 | 35 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 5 | 21 | 27 | 39 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 11 | 23 | 30 | 30 | 7 |
| 65 and over | 14 | 27 | 25 | 28 | 6 |
| H.S. grad/less | 10 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 9 |
| Some college | 7 | 19 | 30 | 36 | 8 |
| College grad | 1 | 16 | 32 | 47 | 4 |
| Post grad | 6 | 14 | 43 | 34 | 3 |
| Democrat | 10 | 25 | 31 | 26 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 6 | 21 | 34 | 28 | 12 |
| Republican | 5 | 16 | 32 | 43 | 4 |
| Seattle | 10 | 24 | 28 | 30 | 8 |
| Baltimore | 7 | 25 | 29 | 26 | 13 |
| Chicago | 7 | 20 | 34 | 35 | 5 |
| San Antonio | 8 | 16 | 37 | 33 | 6 |
| Nashville | 7 | 19 | 29 | 41 | 5 |

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

## TABLE 18

### POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE SOVIET UNION WILL ATTACK OTHER NATIONS THE WAY THEY INVADED AFGHANISTAN

| The Soviet Union will attack other nations in the way they invaded Afghanistan | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 30 | 39 | 22 | 9 |
| Male | 25 | 41 | 28 | 7 |
| Female | 35 | 37 | 18 | 11 |
| 18-29 | 18 | 49 | 25 | 8 |
| 30-39 | 28 | 42 | 21 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 39 | 31 | 24 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 36 | 34 | 19 | 11 |
| 65 and over | 31 | 37 | 25 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 31 | 38 | 19 | 13 |
| Some college | 29 | 42 | 23 | 6 |
| College grad | 29 | 39 | 27 | 4 |
| Post grad | 26 | 36 | 32 | 6 |
| Democrat | 26 | 40 | 24 | 10 |
| Independent/other | 28 | 43 | 22 | 8 |
| Republican | 34 | 38 | 22 | 6 |
| Seattle | 21 | 38 | 33 | 8 |
| Baltimore | 28 | 35 | 27 | 10 |
| Chicago | 29 | 38 | 21 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 42 | 41 | 12 | 5 |
| Nashville | 31 | 41 | 20 | 9 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 19

### POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE SOVIET UNION WILL LAUNCH AN ALL OUT NUCLEAR ATTACK ON THE U.S.

| Sooner of later, the Soviet Union will launch an all out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S. | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 9 | 18 | 65 | 8 |
| Male | 6 | 11 | 77 | 6 |
| Female | 11 | 26 | 54 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 8 | 19 | 65 | 8 |
| 30-39 | 9 | 15 | 69 | 7 |
| 40-49 | 8 | 18 | 69 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 18 | 63 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 6 | 22 | 65 | 7 |
| H.S. grad/less | 11 | 21 | 56 | 11 |
| Some college | 7 | 20 | 68 | 6 |
| College grad | 5 | 12 | 81 | 2 |
| Post grad | 5 | 12 | 77 | 6 |
| Democrat | 9 | 17 | 64 | 10 |
| Independent/other | 7 | 17 | 73 | 4 |
| Republican | 6 | 20 | 69 | 5 |
| Seattle | 4 | 11 | 79 | 6 |
| Baltimore | 12 | 15 | 63 | 10 |
| Chicago | 5 | 19 | 66 | 10 |
| San Antonio | 14 | 27 | 50 | 9 |
| Nashville | 8 | 20 | 67 | 5 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 20

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE ARMS RACE WITH THE SOVIETS WILL LEAD TO NUCLEAR WAR

| The arms race with the Soviets will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 17 | 27 | 42 | 14 |
| Male | 17 | 22 | 49 | 12 |
| Female | 17 | 32 | 36 | 16 |
| 18-29 | 21 | 30 | 37 | 13 |
| 30-39 | 17 | 30 | 38 | 15 |
| 40-49 | 15 | 28 | 46 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 15 | 24 | 46 | 16 |
| 65 and over | 13 | 22 | 51 | 14 |
| H.S. grad/less | 18 | 29 | 37 | 16 |
| Some college | 18 | 28 | 40 | 13 |
| College grad | 12 | 25 | 54 | 9 |
| Post grad | 11 | 22 | 58 | 9 |
| Democrat | 20 | 25 | 42 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 18 | 33 | 35 | 15 |
| Republican | 11 | 27 | 50 | 13 |
| Seattle | 17 | 26 | 46 | 11 |
| Baltimore | 22 | 28 | 38 | 13 |
| Chicago | 13 | 25 | 47 | 15 |
| San Antonio | 18 | 28 | 38 | 16 |
| Nashville | 13 | 28 | 43 | 16 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 21

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: WE WILL DAMAGE OUR ECONOMY BY SPENDING TOO MUCH TO DEFEND OTHER COUNTRIES

| We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 36 | 37 | 20 | 8 |
| Male | 35 | 37 | 21 | 7 |
| Female | 36 | 37 | 18 | 9 |
| 18-29 | 34 | 36 | 17 | 13 |
| 30-39 | 27 | 37 | 27 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 31 | 34 | 29 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 42 | 41 | 15 | 3 |
| 65 and over | 44 | 28 | 13 | 5 |
| H.S. grad/less | 39 | 33 | 16 | 11 |
| Some college | 38 | 35 | 21 | 7 |
| College grad | 25 | 47 | 26 | 3 |
| Post grad | 24 | 44 | 27 | 5 |
| Democrat | 39 | 36 | 17 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 40 | 40 | 14 | 6 |
| Republican | 30 | 38 | 26 | 7 |
| Seattle | 41 | 34 | 18 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 33 | 42 | 16 | 9 |
| Chicago | 38 | 39 | 16 | 8 |
| San Antonio | 35 | 36 | 22 | 6 |
| Nashville | 32 | 34 | 25 | 9 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 22

### POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: WE WILL SIGN AN ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT THAT WILL LEAVE US IN A WEAK POSITION

| We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 11 | 21 | 57 | 10 |
| Male | 11 | 21 | 59 | 8 |
| Female | 11 | 22 | 55 | 12 |
| 18-29 | 11 | 19 | 58 | 13 |
| 30-39 | 8 | 29 | 57 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 9 | 22 | 63 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 21 | 55 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 14 | 22 | 52 | 12 |
| H.S. grad/less | 11 | 24 | 51 | 14 |
| Some college | 11 | 20 | 60 | 9 |
| College grad | 8 | 26 | 61 | 6 |
| Post grad | 9 | 19 | 66 | 6 |
| Democrat | 9 | 17 | 61 | 12 |
| Independent/other | 8 | 26 | 57 | 9 |
| Republican | 13 | 26 | 54 | 6 |
| Seattle | 11 | 20 | 61 | 8 |
| Baltimore | 9 | 17 | 61 | 14 |
| Chicago | 11 | 19 | 60 | 10 |
| San Antonio | 17 | 23 | 50 | 10 |
| Nashville | 9 | 28 | 53 | 10 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

# TABLE 23

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: MISTRUST AND HOSTILITY WILL KEEP US FROM WORKING WITH THE SOVIETS ON REAL PROBLEMS LIKE TERRORISM

| Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 26 | 46 | 20 | 8 |
| Male | 25 | 48 | 20 | 7 |
| Female | 26 | 44 | 21 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 30 | 48 | 17 | 6 |
| 30-39 | 23 | 50 | 21 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 25 | 44 | 21 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 25 | 45 | 23 | 8 |
| 65 and over | 21 | 45 | 25 | 9 |
| H.S. grad/less | 25 | 44 | 21 | 10 |
| Some college | 27 | 48 | 17 | 8 |
| College grad | 20 | 51 | 26 | 3 |
| Post grad | 25 | 45 | 26 | 4 |
| Democrat | 29 | 44 | 20 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 24 | 44 | 27 | 6 |
| Republican | 22 | 51 | 20 | 7 |
| Seattle | 24 | 46 | 21 | 10 |
| Baltimore | 29 | 43 | 18 | 10 |
| Chicago | 26 | 45 | 23 | 6 |
| San Antonio | 25 | 50 | 18 | 7 |
| Nashville | 24 | 45 | 22 | 9 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 24

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: A REGIONAL WAR (LIKE IN THE MIDDLE EAST) WILL ESCALATE INTO ALL OUT WAR

| A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into an all out war | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 17 | 34 | 35 | 14 |
| | | | | |
| Male | 15 | 32 | 43 | 10 |
| Female | 18 | 36 | 28 | 18 |
| | | | | |
| 18-29 | 17 | 35 | 31 | 17 |
| 30-39 | 20 | 36 | 31 | 13 |
| 40-49 | 19 | 35 | 36 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 35 | 36 | 14 |
| 65 and over | 11 | 33 | 44 | 12 |
| | | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 15 | 36 | 29 | 19 |
| Some college | 18 | 34 | 36 | 12 |
| College grad | 15 | 35 | 43 | 7 |
| Post grad | 20 | 32 | 40 | 7 |
| | | | | |
| Democrat | 17 | 35 | 31 | 17 |
| Independent/other | 17 | 37 | 39 | 8 |
| Republican | 17 | 34 | 39 | 10 |
| | | | | |
| Seattle | 13 | 37 | 37 | 13 |
| Baltimore | 20 | 30 | 35 | 16 |
| Chicago | 16 | 35 | 34 | 15 |
| San Antonio | 19 | 38 | 31 | 12 |
| Nashville | 16 | 30 | 41 | 13 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE U.S. WILL ACT AS "WORLD POLICEMAN" AND GET INTO ANOTHER VIETNAM

| The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 17 | 36 | 40 | 8 |
| Male | 16 | 33 | 45 | 6 |
| Female | 17 | 38 | 35 | 10 |
| 18-29 | 12 | 41 | 38 | 9 |
| 30-39 | 18 | 40 | 33 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 19 | 35 | 40 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 15 | 33 | 45 | 6 |
| 65 and over | 16 | 29 | 46 | 9 |
| H.S. grad/less | 17 | 34 | 38 | 11 |
| Some college | 17 | 35 | 41 | 7 |
| College grad | 9 | 45 | 41 | 6 |
| Post grad | 18 | 37 | 42 | 3 |
| Democrat | 17 | 40 | 34 | 9 |
| Independent/other | 14 | 34 | 49 | 3 |
| Republican | 15 | 32 | 46 | 7 |
| Seattle | 14 | 34 | 43 | 10 |
| Baltimore | 16 | 39 | 36 | 9 |
| Chicago | 15 | 34 | 42 | 8 |
| San Antonio | 22 | 37 | 35 | 6 |
| Nashville | 15 | 34 | 45 | 7 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

# TABLE 26

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: MARXISM/ COMMUNISM WILL SPREAD TO MORE COUNTRIES AROUND THE WORLD

| Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world | Very Likely<br>% | Somewhat Likely<br>% | Not that Likely<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 17 | 43 | 28 | 12 |
| Male | 17 | 44 | 30 | 9 |
| Female | 17 | 42 | 27 | 14 |
| 18-29 | 11 | 41 | 32 | 17 |
| 30-39 | 13 | 48 | 30 | 9 |
| 40-49 | 18 | 46 | 26 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 26 | 42 | 22 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 15 | 40 | 37 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 17 | 38 | 32 | 13 |
| Some college | 14 | 45 | 29 | 11 |
| College grad | 16 | 53 | 25 | 6 |
| Post grad | 16 | 46 | 24 | 14 |
| Democrat | 16 | 40 | 30 | 14 |
| Independent/other | 17 | 45 | 29 | 9 |
| Republican | 16 | 46 | 28 | 10 |
| Seattle | 12 | 46 | 30 | 12 |
| Baltimore | 16 | 36 | 33 | 15 |
| Chicago | 19 | 40 | 29 | 11 |
| San Antonio | 24 | 48 | 19 | 10 |
| Nashville | 15 | 44 | 30 | 12 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 27

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE SOVIETS WILL INCREASE THEIR SUPPORT OF COUNTRIES LIKE LYBIA AND OTHER TERRORISTS

| The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Lybia and terrorist groups in the Middle East | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 21 | 46 | 20 | 14 |
| | | | | |
| Male | 19 | 44 | 26 | 11 |
| Female | 23 | 47 | 14 | 16 |
| | | | | |
| 18-29 | 15 | 45 | 24 | 16 |
| 30-39 | 19 | 47 | 21 | 13 |
| 40-49 | 24 | 50 | 15 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 26 | 46 | 15 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 21 | 44 | 25 | 11 |
| | | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 22 | 43 | 20 | 16 |
| Some college | 19 | 50 | 20 | 11 |
| College grad | 20 | 47 | 25 | 9 |
| Post grad | 23 | 44 | 14 | 19 |
| | | | | |
| Democrat | 19 | 44 | 21 | 16 |
| Independent/other | 16 | 46 | 30 | 9 |
| Republican | 24 | 50 | 15 | 11 |
| | | | | |
| Seattle | 14 | 43 | 25 | 18 |
| Baltimore | 17 | 46 | 20 | 17 |
| Chicago | 17 | 49 | 22 | 13 |
| San Antonio | 32 | 43 | 18 | 8 |
| Nashville | 25 | 48 | 13 | 14 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 28

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: A SMALLER COUNTRY (LIKE PAKISTAN OR ISRAEL) WILL USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

| A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 20 | 41 | 28 | 10 |
| Male | 22 | 44 | 26 | 8 |
| Female | 18 | 39 | 30 | 13 |
| 18-29 | 18 | 45 | 25 | 13 |
| 30-39 | 20 | 36 | 34 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 22 | 45 | 29 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 20 | 42 | 27 | 10 |
| 65 and over | 20 | 42 | 30 | 9 |
| H.S. grad/less | 18 | 38 | 31 | 13 |
| Some college | 21 | 43 | 27 | 8 |
| College grad | 25 | 44 | 22 | 8 |
| Post grad | 16 | 48 | 31 | 5 |
| Democrat | 20 | 39 | 30 | 12 |
| Independent/other | 19 | 46 | 28 | 7 |
| Republican | 21 | 43 | 27 | 9 |
| Seattle | 18 | 47 | 24 | 11 |
| Baltimore | 26 | 32 | 31 | 11 |
| Chicago | 15 | 42 | 30 | 13 |
| San Antonio | 21 | 44 | 26 | 9 |
| Nashville | 22 | 41 | 31 | 7 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 29

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: POOR COMMUNICATION WILL RESULT IN INCIDENTS BECOMING CRISES THAT THREATEN WAR

| Poor communication will cause a conflict or incident (like the downing of the Korean airliner) to become a crisis that threatens war | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 21 | 46 | 25 | 8 |
| Male | 20 | 45 | 29 | 7 |
| Female | 23 | 47 | 20 | 9 |
| 18-29 | 23 | 52 | 18 | 7 |
| 30-39 | 20 | 45 | 30 | 6 |
| 40-49 | 19 | 51 | 24 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 20 | 40 | 32 | 8 |
| 65 and over | 21 | 42 | 26 | 11 |
| H.S. grad/less | 22 | 42 | 24 | 12 |
| Some college | 21 | 48 | 27 | 5 |
| College grad | 20 | 51 | 23 | 6 |
| Post grad | 18 | 54 | 27 | 1 |
| Democrat | 24 | 43 | 23 | 11 |
| Independent/other | 21 | 53 | 22 | 5 |
| Republican | 19 | 47 | 29 | 5 |
| Seattle | 20 | 46 | 27 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 21 | 45 | 23 | 11 |
| Chicago | 16 | 51 | 25 | 8 |
| San Antonio | 26 | 43 | 25 | 7 |
| Nashville | 24 | 45 | 24 | 7 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 30

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: WE WILL NEGLECT PROBLEMS IN THE U.S. BECAUSE WE SPEND SO MUCH ON A NEVER-ENDING ARMS RACE

| We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 33 | 36 | 26 | 4 |
| Male | 32 | 37 | 27 | 4 |
| Female | 34 | 36 | 25 | 4 |
| 18-29 | 34 | 38 | 22 | 6 |
| 30-39 | 28 | 41 | 28 | 3 |
| 40-49 | 32 | 35 | 29 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 31 | 36 | 31 | 3 |
| 65 and over | 37 | 33 | 26 | 5 |
| H.S. grad/less | 33 | 37 | 25 | 7 |
| Some college | 35 | 38 | 25 | 3 |
| College grad | 26 | 35 | 36 | 3 |
| Post grad | 31 | 41 | 26 | 2 |
| Democrat | 39 | 38 | 19 | 3 |
| Independent/other | 38 | 35 | 22 | 5 |
| Republican | 21 | 38 | 38 | 4 |
| Seattle | 38 | 36 | 23 | 4 |
| Baltimore | 35 | 36 | 23 | 7 |
| Chicago | 34 | 34 | 30 | 3 |
| San Antonio | 32 | 37 | 28 | 3 |
| Nashville | 28 | 40 | 27 | 5 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 31

## POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: A NUCLEAR WEAPON WILL BE LAUNCHED ACCIDENTALLY BY A COMPUTER

| A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by a computer | Very Likely % | Somewhat Likely % | Not that Likely % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 11 | 22 | 54 | 14 |
| Male | 8 | 21 | 58 | 14 |
| Female | 14 | 22 | 50 | 14 |
| 18-29 | 11 | 25 | 49 | 15 |
| 30-39 | 10 | 22 | 56 | 12 |
| 40-49 | 11 | 21 | 55 | 14 |
| 50-64 | 11 | 20 | 57 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 11 | 18 | 58 | 14 |
| H.S. grad/less | 13 | 22 | 48 | 17 |
| Some college | 9 | 23 | 55 | 14 |
| College grad | 10 | 20 | 65 | 6 |
| Post grad | 11 | 16 | 65 | 8 |
| Democrat | 14 | 20 | 50 | 17 |
| Independent/other | 9 | 27 | 53 | 11 |
| Republican | 7 | 22 | 61 | 10 |
| Seattle | 6 | 22 | 57 | 15 |
| Baltimore | 14 | 23 | 53 | 10 |
| Chicago | 10 | 27 | 46 | 18 |
| San Antonio | 13 | 19 | 53 | 15 |
| Nashville | 13 | 17 | 58 | 12 |

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

## TABLE 32

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: TRULY WANT TO WORK WITH US TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS

| The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 45 | 28 | 27 |
| Male | 51 | 28 | 21 |
| Female | 40 | 29 | 32 |
| 18-29 | 46 | 27 | 28 |
| 30-39 | 50 | 27 | 24 |
| 40-49 | 46 | 30 | 24 |
| 50-64 | 40 | 31 | 29 |
| 65 and over | 48 | 28 | 25 |
| H.S. grad/less | 41 | 28 | 30 |
| Some college | 49 | 26 | 25 |
| College grad | 44 | 34 | 22 |
| Post grad | 55 | 28 | 17 |
| Democrat | 44 | 26 | 30 |
| Independent/other | 52 | 26 | 22 |
| Republican | 45 | 30 | 25 |
| Seattle | 63 | 16 | 20 |
| Baltimore | 44 | 29 | 27 |
| Chicago | 43 | 29 | 28 |
| San Antonio | 39 | 37 | 24 |
| Nashville | 37 | 30 | 34 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 33

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THOUGH THEY MAY NEVER BE FRIENDS, THEY WANT TO REDUCE THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR AS MUCH AS WE DO

| Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 76 | 12 | 12 |
| Male | 82 | 9 | 9 |
| Female | 70 | 15 | 15 |
| 18-29 | 77 | 13 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 80 | 7 | 13 |
| 40-49 | 78 | 12 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 70 | 16 | 14 |
| 65 and over | 81 | 9 | 10 |
| H.S. grad/less | 69 | 16 | 16 |
| Some college | 80 | 10 | 10 |
| College grad | 87 | 5 | 8 |
| Post grad | 83 | 10 | 7 |
| Democrat | 77 | 10 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 75 | 12 | 13 |
| Republican | 79 | 11 | 10 |
| Seattle | 86 | 4 | 10 |
| Baltimore | 73 | 12 | 14 |
| Chicago | 78 | 9 | 13 |
| San Antonio | 69 | 20 | 11 |
| Nashville | 75 | 13 | 12 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 34

### AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY WANT EVERY COUNTRY IN THE WORLD TO BE COMMUNIST AND WILL NEVER STOP TRYING TO REACH THAT GOAL

| No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 51 | 24 | 25 |
| Male | 52 | 28 | 20 |
| Female | 51 | 20 | 29 |
| 18-29 | 35 | 38 | 28 |
| 30-39 | 51 | 26 | 23 |
| 40-49 | 59 | 20 | 21 |
| 50-64 | 60 | 16 | 24 |
| 65 and over | 61 | 16 | 23 |
| H.S. grad/less | 46 | 25 | 28 |
| Some college | 58 | 24 | 19 |
| College grad | 52 | 23 | 25 |
| Post grad | 52 | 26 | 23 |
| Democrat | 47 | 23 | 30 |
| Independent/other | 50 | 30 | 21 |
| Republican | 59 | 23 | 18 |
| Seattle | 43 | 30 | 27 |
| Baltimore | 49 | 18 | 32 |
| Chicago | 48 | 29 | 24 |
| San Antonio | 59 | 21 | 20 |
| Nashville | 56 | 24 | 20 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

# TABLE 35

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY HAVE SO MANY OF THEIR OWN PROBLEMS THEY DON'T REALLY POSE A THREAT

| The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S. | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 14 | 75 | 11 |
| | | | |
| Male | 18 | 72 | 11 |
| Female | 10 | 79 | 11 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 13 | 75 | 12 |
| 30-39 | 10 | 80 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 13 | 81 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 11 | 78 | 11 |
| 65 and over | 21 | 64 | 16 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 14 | 74 | 13 |
| Some college | 13 | 78 | 9 |
| College grad | 14 | 76 | 11 |
| Post grad | 11 | 79 | 11 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 12 | 75 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 17 | 75 | 8 |
| Republican | 12 | 79 | 8 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 21 | 64 | 14 |
| Baltimore | 12 | 81 | 7 |
| Chicago | 11 | 79 | 10 |
| San Antonio | 10 | 81 | 9 |
| Nashville | 13 | 72 | 15 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 36

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WHILE THEY MAY BE RUTHLESS, THEY ARE NOT RECKLESS OR IRRATIONAL

| While the leaders of the Soviet Union may be ruthless, they are not reckless or irrational fanatics | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 67 | 15 | 18 |
| Male | 74 | 12 | 14 |
| Female | 60 | 19 | 21 |
| 18-29 | 64 | 15 | 21 |
| 30-39 | 68 | 16 | 16 |
| 40-49 | 69 | 15 | 16 |
| 50-64 | 66 | 18 | 16 |
| 65 and over | 73 | 10 | 17 |
| H.S. grad/less | 56 | 22 | 23 |
| Some college | 72 | 11 | 17 |
| College grad | 75 | 12 | 13 |
| Post grad | 86 | 7 | 7 |
| Democrat | 67 | 15 | 18 |
| Independent/other | 67 | 13 | 20 |
| Republican | 71 | 15 | 14 |
| Seattle | 79 | 6 | 16 |
| Baltimore | 67 | 22 | 11 |
| Chicago | 66 | 14 | 21 |
| San Antonio | 63 | 21 | 16 |
| Nashville | 62 | 15 | 24 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 37

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY WILL CHEAT ON ANY NUCLEAR ARMS AGREEMENT THEY SIGN

| The Soviets will cheat on any nuclear arms agreement they sign | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 40 | 24 | 36 |
| Male | 43 | 27 | 30 |
| Female | 37 | 21 | 42 |
| 18-29 | 30 | 33 | 38 |
| 30-39 | 36 | 26 | 37 |
| 40-49 | 40 | 22 | 38 |
| 50-64 | 49 | 15 | 36 |
| 65 and over | 49 | 19 | 32 |
| H.S. grad/less | 36 | 23 | 42 |
| Some college | 44 | 21 | 35 |
| College grad | 43 | 24 | 33 |
| Post grad | 38 | 36 | 27 |
| Democrat | 34 | 26 | 40 |
| Independent/other | 42 | 28 | 31 |
| Republican | 47 | 19 | 34 |
| Seattle | 31 | 32 | 37 |
| Baltimore | 34 | 27 | 39 |
| Chicago | 37 | 30 | 34 |
| San Antonio | 55 | 14 | 31 |
| Nashville | 42 | 18 | 40 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 38

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION:
## WE WILL NEVER BE SAFE WITH OUT A CLEAR MILITARY EDGE OVER THE SOVIETS

| We will never be safe without a clear, decisive military edge over the Soviet Union | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 52 | 31 | 18 |
| | | | |
| Male | 45 | 39 | 16 |
| Female | 58 | 23 | 19 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 42 | 43 | 15 |
| 30-39 | 50 | 32 | 18 |
| 40-49 | 50 | 34 | 16 |
| 50-64 | 60 | 20 | 20 |
| 65 and over | 59 | 21 | 20 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 58 | 23 | 19 |
| Some college | 49 | 31 | 20 |
| College grad | 42 | 43 | 15 |
| Post grad | 43 | 48 | 10 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 50 | 31 | 18 |
| Independent/other | 42 | 44 | 15 |
| Republican | 58 | 27 | 16 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 35 | 46 | 19 |
| Baltimore | 50 | 31 | 19 |
| Chicago | 45 | 32 | 23 |
| San Antonio | 70 | 17 | 13 |
| Nashville | 58 | 26 | 15 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

# TABLE 39

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WE'RE SO CONCERNED ABOUT THE SOVIETS THAT WE'RE LOSING TO ECONOMIC RIVALS LIKE JAPAN

| We're so concerned about our military rival, the Soviet Union, that we're losing to our economic rivals such as Japan and Germany | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 57 | 20 | 23 |
| Male | 60 | 22 | 18 |
| Female | 54 | 19 | 28 |
| 18-29 | 48 | 24 | 28 |
| 30-39 | 51 | 23 | 27 |
| 40-49 | 57 | 25 | 18 |
| 50-64 | 62 | 17 | 21 |
| 65 and over | 68 | 15 | 17 |
| H.S. grad/less | 48 | 23 | 29 |
| Some college | 59 | 20 | 22 |
| College grad | 64 | 20 | 16 |
| Post grad | 68 | 20 | 12 |
| Democrat | 60 | 18 | 22 |
| Independent/other | 62 | 18 | 21 |
| Republican | 53 | 24 | 23 |
| Seattle | 63 | 17 | 20 |
| Baltimore | 51 | 21 | 29 |
| Chicago | 58 | 22 | 20 |
| San Antonio | 57 | 22 | 22 |
| Nashville | 55 | 21 | 24 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 40

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WORKING TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS WOULD BE A MISTAKE BECAUSE THEY WOULD STEAL OUR HIGH TECHNOLOGY

| Working with the Soviets to solve common problems would be a serious mistake because they would take advantage of us and steal our high technology | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 28 | 51 | 22 |
| | | | |
| Male | 29 | 55 | 17 |
| Female | 27 | 47 | 27 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 20 | 57 | 23 |
| 30-39 | 26 | 55 | 19 |
| 40-49 | 26 | 54 | 20 |
| 50-64 | 30 | 47 | 23 |
| 65 and over | 36 | 41 | 24 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 30 | 44 | 26 |
| Some college | 30 | 50 | 21 |
| College grad | 18 | 67 | 15 |
| Post grad | 21 | 64 | 16 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 27 | 51 | 22 |
| Independent/other | 25 | 52 | 22 |
| Republican | 29 | 50 | 21 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 22 | 61 | 17 |
| Baltimore | 30 | 52 | 17 |
| Chicago | 23 | 49 | 29 |
| San Antonio | 37 | 42 | 21 |
| Nashville | 27 | 49 | 25 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

# TABLE 41

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY ARE READY TO 'DO BUSINESS' JUST LIKE THE CHINESE IN THE 1970's

| The new Soviet leaders are ready to "do business" with us just like the Chinese were in the 1970's | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 39 | 16 | 46 |
| Male | 48 | 15 | 37 |
| Female | 30 | 16 | 54 |
| 18-29 | 35 | 14 | 51 |
| 30-39 | 41 | 20 | 40 |
| 40-49 | 39 | 13 | 49 |
| 50-64 | 36 | 16 | 48 |
| 65 and over | 46 | 17 | 37 |
| H.S. grad/less | 30 | 19 | 51 |
| Some college | 41 | 13 | 45 |
| College grad | 46 | 11 | 43 |
| Post grad | 52 | 21 | 27 |
| Democrat | 38 | 17 | 45 |
| Independent/other | 40 | 14 | 46 |
| Republican | 41 | 15 | 45 |
| Seattle | 51 | 16 | 33 |
| Baltimore | 35 | 15 | 49 |
| Chicago | 34 | 16 | 51 |
| San Antonio | 37 | 17 | 46 |
| Nashville | 37 | 15 | 49 |

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

## TABLE 42

## VIEW OF THE RESULTS OF AN IMPROVED SOVIET ECONOMY

| If the Soviets became better off, would they be more or less of a threat | More a Threat<br>% | Less a Threat<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 47 | 33 | 19 |
| | | | |
| Male | 44 | 40 | 16 |
| Female | 50 | 28 | 22 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 41 | 36 | 23 |
| 30-39 | 44 | 33 | 23 |
| 40-49 | 52 | 31 | 16 |
| 50-64 | 56 | 26 | 19 |
| 65 and over | 48 | 40 | 11 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 47 | 30 | 23 |
| Some college | 49 | 34 | 16 |
| College grad | 49 | 32 | 20 |
| Post grad | 44 | 43 | 13 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 43 | 36 | 21 |
| Independent/other | 46 | 35 | 19 |
| Republican | 54 | 31 | 15 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 37 | 43 | 19 |
| Baltimore | 43 | 37 | 20 |
| Chicago | 41 | 36 | 23 |
| San Antonio | 63 | 21 | 16 |
| Nashville | 53 | 30 | 17 |

"Which of these statements comes closer to your own view?

Statement A: If the Soviet Union became better off economically, they would use their increased wealth to stir up trouble by funding communist revolutionaries around the world.
OR
Statement B: If the Soviet Union became better off economically, they would become less of a threat because they would have more to lose in conflict."

## TABLE 43

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE SOVIETS ARE CONSTANTLY TESTING US FOR WEAKNESS AND ARE QUICK TO TAKE ADVANTAGE WHEN THEY FIND IT

| The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 68 | 16 | 16 |
| Male | 70 | 15 | 14 |
| Female | 66 | 17 | 17 |
| 18-29 | 54 | 22 | 24 |
| 30-39 | 63 | 21 | 17 |
| 40-49 | 74 | 18 | 9 |
| 50-64 | 80 | 8 | 12 |
| 65 and over | 76 | 11 | 13 |
| H.S. grad/less | 65 | 17 | 19 |
| Some college | 69 | 15 | 16 |
| College grad | 71 | 19 | 11 |
| Post grad | 71 | 17 | 12 |
| Democrat | 67 | 18 | 16 |
| Independent/other | 65 | 20 | 15 |
| Republican | 73 | 12 | 15 |
| Seattle | 57 | 22 | 21 |
| Baltimore | 68 | 19 | 14 |
| Chicago | 66 | 19 | 16 |
| San Antonio | 76 | 10 | 14 |
| Nashville | 75 | 12 | 13 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 44

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: WE SHOULD LIVE AND LET LIVE WITH COMMUNISTS

| We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 50 | 34 | 17 |
| Male | 57 | 29 | 14 |
| Female | 43 | 38 | 19 |
| 18-29 | 51 | 31 | 18 |
| 30-39 | 49 | 35 | 17 |
| 40-49 | 45 | 36 | 19 |
| 50-64 | 49 | 36 | 16 |
| 65 and over | 56 | 30 | 14 |
| H.S. grad/less | 48 | 35 | 17 |
| Some college | 51 | 33 | 16 |
| College grad | 50 | 30 | 20 |
| Post grad | 52 | 34 | 14 |
| Democrat | 51 | 31 | 17 |
| Independent/other | 60 | 28 | 12 |
| Republican | 44 | 39 | 17 |
| Seattle | 62 | 25 | 13 |
| Baltimore | 53 | 27 | 20 |
| Chicago | 47 | 35 | 18 |
| San Antonio | 44 | 42 | 14 |
| Nashville | 42 | 39 | 19 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

# TABLE 45

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE SOVIET UNION IS LIKE HITLER'S GERMANY -- AND EVIL EMPIRE TRYING TO RULE THE WORLD

| The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 38 | 42 | 20 |
| | | | |
| Male | 33 | 49 | 17 |
| Female | 43 | 35 | 22 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 30 | 52 | 19 |
| 30-39 | 32 | 52 | 16 |
| 40-49 | 37 | 42 | 21 |
| 50-64 | 51 | 27 | 22 |
| 65 and over | 41 | 34 | 25 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 41 | 36 | 23 |
| Some college | 40 | 38 | 22 |
| College grad | 32 | 54 | 14 |
| Post grad | 24 | 64 | 12 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 37 | 43 | 20 |
| Independent/other | 32 | 43 | 26 |
| Republican | 42 | 41 | 18 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 22 | 58 | 20 |
| Baltimore | 38 | 34 | 28 |
| Chicago | 38 | 45 | 17 |
| San Antonio | 54 | 27 | 19 |
| Nashville | 38 | 46 | 16 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 46

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE U.S. BLAMES THE SOVIETS FOR TROUBLES IN OTHER COUNTRIES CAUSED BY POVERTY, HUNGER AND REPRESSION

| The U.S. often blames the Soviet Union for troubles in other countries that are really caused by poverty, hunger, political corruption and repression | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 44 | 32 | 24 |
| Male | 49 | 31 | 20 |
| Female | 40 | 32 | 28 |
| 18-29 | 42 | 30 | 28 |
| 30-39 | 36 | 39 | 25 |
| 40-49 | 46 | 31 | 24 |
| 50-64 | 44 | 35 | 21 |
| 65 and over | 55 | 25 | 20 |
| H.S. grad/less | 36 | 36 | 28 |
| Some college | 45 | 29 | 27 |
| College grad | 56 | 30 | 14 |
| Post grad | 56 | 35 | 10 |
| Democrat | 46 | 30 | 24 |
| Independent/other | 50 | 29 | 21 |
| Republican | 42 | 36 | 23 |
| Seattle | 56 | 23 | 21 |
| Baltimore | 42 | 29 | 30 |
| Chicago | 44 | 38 | 18 |
| San Antonio | 41 | 35 | 24 |
| Nashville | 39 | 34 | 27 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 47

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: BECAUSE THE SOVIETS WILL NOT KEEP THEIR END OF THE BARGAIN, WE SHOULD NOT SIGN ANY NUCLEAR ARMS AGREEMENTS

| Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 24 | 55 | 21 |
| | | | |
| Male | 18 | 64 | 18 |
| Female | 30 | 47 | 23 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 25 | 56 | 19 |
| 30-39 | 20 | 58 | 22 |
| 40-49 | 26 | 59 | 15 |
| 50-64 | 24 | 51 | 26 |
| 65 and over | 20 | 59 | 22 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 30 | 45 | 25 |
| Some college | 23 | 58 | 19 |
| College grad | 11 | 74 | 15 |
| Post grad | 16 | 73 | 11 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 23 | 56 | 21 |
| Independent/other | 21 | 59 | 20 |
| Republican | 22 | 58 | 19 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 16 | 67 | 16 |
| Baltimore | 23 | 55 | 22 |
| Chicago | 25 | 55 | 21 |
| San Antonio | 29 | 50 | 21 |
| Nashville | 27 | 49 | 24 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

# TABLE 48

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: FORCE IS THE ONLY LANGUAGE THE SOVIETS UNDERSTAND

| The only language the Soviets understand is force, and we have to prove to them that they can't push us around | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 43 | 42 | 15 |
| | | | |
| Male | 42 | 46 | 12 |
| Female | 44 | 38 | 18 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 37 | 49 | 14 |
| 30-39 | 40 | 47 | 13 |
| 40-49 | 38 | 49 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 49 | 31 | 21 |
| 65 and over | 53 | 32 | 16 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 51 | 36 | 13 |
| Some college | 38 | 46 | 16 |
| College grad | 38 | 47 | 15 |
| Post grad | 32 | 51 | 17 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 38 | 45 | 17 |
| Independent/other | 40 | 49 | 11 |
| Republican | 52 | 35 | 13 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 31 | 53 | 16 |
| Baltimore | 41 | 41 | 18 |
| Chicago | 44 | 44 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 50 | 34 | 16 |
| Nashville | 49 | 38 | 14 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 49

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE U.S. WOULD BE SAFER IF IT LEARNED TO LIVE WITH COMMUNISM

| The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to stop the spread of communism and learned to live with them, the way we live with China and Yugoslavia | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 37 | 45 | 19 |
| Male | 41 | 44 | 15 |
| Female | 32 | 46 | 22 |
| 18-29 | 40 | 39 | 21 |
| 30-39 | 40 | 44 | 17 |
| 40-49 | 30 | 52 | 18 |
| 50-64 | 31 | 49 | 20 |
| 65 and over | 39 | 49 | 13 |
| H.S. grad/less | 32 | 50 | 18 |
| Some college | 39 | 41 | 20 |
| College grad | 32 | 52 | 16 |
| Post grad | 46 | 37 | 17 |
| Democrat | 41 | 41 | 18 |
| Independent/other | 46 | 32 | 21 |
| Republican | 29 | 56 | 15 |
| Seattle | 55 | 33 | 12 |
| Baltimore | 36 | 41 | 23 |
| Chicago | 35 | 47 | 18 |
| San Antonio | 27 | 54 | 20 |
| Nashville | 30 | 50 | 20 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 50

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: ONE DAY THE U.S. WILL HAVE TO FIGHT THE SOVIET UNION TO STOP COMMUNISM

| When all is said and done, one day the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 26 | 42 | 33 |
| Male | 20 | 50 | 30 |
| Female | 32 | 33 | 35 |
| 18-29 | 29 | 40 | 32 |
| 30-39 | 27 | 42 | 31 |
| 40-49 | 22 | 44 | 34 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 39 | 34 |
| 65 and over | 22 | 46 | 32 |
| H.S. grad/less | 32 | 32 | 36 |
| Some college | 27 | 41 | 33 |
| College grad | 18 | 59 | 23 |
| Post grad | 10 | 58 | 32 |
| Democrat | 24 | 45 | 31 |
| Independent/other | 23 | 44 | 33 |
| Republican | 27 | 40 | 34 |
| Seattle | 14 | 59 | 27 |
| Baltimore | 25 | 40 | 35 |
| Chicago | 23 | 42 | 35 |
| San Antonio | 40 | 31 | 30 |
| Nashville | 28 | 36 | 37 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 51

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: IF WE HAD A BIGGER NUCLEAR ARSENAL THAN THE SOVIETS, THEY WOULD BUILD UNTIL THEY CAUGHT UP

| If we had a bigger nuclear arsenal than the Soviets, they would keep building until they caught up | Agree % | Disagree % | Not Sure % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 83 | 6 | 12 |
| Male | 85 | 6 | 10 |
| Female | 81 | 5 | 14 |
| 18-29 | 85 | 4 | 11 |
| 30-39 | 82 | 7 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 78 | 6 | 16 |
| 50-64 | 82 | 5 | 13 |
| 65 and over | 87 | 6 | 8 |
| H.S. grad/less | 79 | 7 | 15 |
| Some college | 83 | 6 | 11 |
| College grad | 88 | 4 | 9 |
| Post grad | 87 | 3 | 10 |
| Democrat | 82 | 5 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 84 | 4 | 12 |
| Republican | 86 | 5 | 9 |
| Seattle | 79 | 7 | 14 |
| Baltimore | 81 | 5 | 14 |
| Chicago | 81 | 9 | 11 |
| San Antonio | 88 | 2 | 9 |
| Nashville | 85 | 4 | 11 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

# TABLE 52

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THAT ALL LIFE ON EARTH COULD BE DESTROYED IN A NUCLEAR WAR IS A WILD EXAGGERATION

| The idea that all life on earth could be destroyed in a nuclear war is a wild exaggeration | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 13 | 80 | 8 |
| | | | |
| Male | 15 | 79 | 6 |
| Female | 11 | 81 | 9 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 8 | 83 | 9 |
| 30-39 | 8 | 88 | 4 |
| 40-49 | 11 | 85 | 4 |
| 50-64 | 17 | 76 | 7 |
| 65 and over | 21 | 67 | 12 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 16 | 76 | 9 |
| Some college | 11 | 84 | 5 |
| College grad | 11 | 80 | 8 |
| Post grad | 6 | 87 | 6 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 12 | 80 | 8 |
| Independent/other | 10 | 84 | 6 |
| Republican | 15 | 79 | 7 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 10 | 83 | 7 |
| Baltimore | 15 | 77 | 9 |
| Chicago | 16 | 78 | 7 |
| San Antonio | 12 | 78 | 9 |
| Nashville | 11 | 82 | 7 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

# TABLE 52

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: TO GUARANTEE AMERICA'S SECURITY, WE MUST HAVE A NUCLEAR ARSENAL EQUAL TO, BUT NOT GREATER THAN, THE SOVIET'S

| To guarantee America's security, we must have a nuclear arsenal equal to, but not greater than the Soviet Union's | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 38 | 45 | 17 |
| | | | |
| Male | 39 | 45 | 16 |
| Female | 37 | 46 | 18 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 31 | 52 | 17 |
| 30-39 | 34 | 50 | 16 |
| 40-49 | 33 | 48 | 18 |
| 50-64 | 44 | 39 | 17 |
| 65 and over | 54 | 31 | 15 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 36 | 45 | 19 |
| Some college | 37 | 47 | 16 |
| College grad | 44 | 43 | 13 |
| Post grad | 43 | 43 | 14 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 38 | 48 | 14 |
| Independent/other | 44 | 39 | 17 |
| Republican | 37 | 45 | 18 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 38 | 43 | 19 |
| Baltimore | 32 | 50 | 18 |
| Chicago | 38 | 49 | 13 |
| San Antonio | 39 | 49 | 12 |
| Nashville | 43 | 36 | 21 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 54

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE U.S. SHOULD ALWAYS HAVE MORE NUCLEAR WEAPONS THAN THE SOVIETS

| The U.S. should always have more nuclear weapons than the Soviets | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 33 | 47 | 20 |
| | | | |
| Male | 24 | 58 | 19 |
| Female | 41 | 37 | 22 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 23 | 52 | 25 |
| 30-39 | 25 | 56 | 19 |
| 40-49 | 36 | 46 | 18 |
| 50-64 | 45 | 34 | 21 |
| 65 and over | 37 | 47 | 16 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 43 | 33 | 24 |
| Some college | 28 | 54 | 19 |
| College grad | 21 | 60 | 19 |
| Post grad | 26 | 61 | 13 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 37 | 43 | 19 |
| Independent/other | 21 | 58 | 22 |
| Republican | 32 | 48 | 20 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 14 | 65 | 21 |
| Baltimore | 41 | 37 | 22 |
| Chicago | 35 | 48 | 18 |
| San Antonio | 38 | 46 | 17 |
| Nashville | 36 | 40 | 24 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

## TABLE 55

## AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: NOTHING ON EARTH COULD EVER JUSTIFY THE ALL OUT USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

| Nothing on earth could ever justify the all out use of nuclear weapons | Agree<br>% | Disagree<br>% | Not Sure<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 79 | 10 | 12 |
| | | | |
| Male | 77 | 12 | 11 |
| Female | 80 | 7 | 13 |
| | | | |
| 18-29 | 76 | 9 | 15 |
| 30-39 | 81 | 9 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 76 | 8 | 16 |
| 50-64 | 83 | 9 | 8 |
| 65 and over | 82 | 11 | 7 |
| | | | |
| H.S. grad/less | 77 | 7 | 16 |
| Some college | 81 | 8 | 11 |
| College grad | 85 | 10 | 5 |
| Post grad | 77 | 18 | 5 |
| | | | |
| Democrat | 81 | 6 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 80 | 12 | 8 |
| Republican | 77 | 13 | 10 |
| | | | |
| Seattle | 89 | 6 | 5 |
| Baltimore | 74 | 11 | 15 |
| Chicago | 84 | 10 | 7 |
| San Antonio | 70 | 12 | 18 |
| Nashville | 78 | 8 | 15 |

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

# TABLE 56

## MOST LIKELY WAY A NUCLEAR WAR WILL START

| The most likely way a nuclear war will start | Soviets Invade Europe % | Thrd Wrld Escalates % | Terrorist Uses Nuke % | Acci-dent % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 15 | 52 | 21 | 12 |
| Male | 10 | 56 | 24 | 10 |
| Female | 19 | 49 | 18 | 14 |
| 18-29 | 14 | 56 | 20 | 10 |
| 30-39 | 12 | 51 | 21 | 15 |
| 40-49 | 15 | 58 | 17 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 15 | 53 | 22 | 9 |
| 65 and over | 16 | 40 | 29 | 15 |
| H.S. grad/less | 20 | 46 | 19 | 15 |
| Some college | 13 | 55 | 19 | 13 |
| College grad | 10 | 56 | 28 | 7 |
| Post grad | 6 | 62 | 26 | 5 |
| Democrat | 17 | 52 | 21 | 10 |
| Independent/other | 10 | 43 | 31 | 17 |
| Republican | 13 | 58 | 19 | 11 |
| Seattle | 8 | 59 | 22 | 11 |
| Baltimore | 17 | 54 | 16 | 13 |
| Chicago | 17 | 50 | 20 | 14 |
| San Antonio | 22 | 44 | 21 | 13 |
| Nashville | 11 | 53 | 26 | 10 |

"Experts feel that there are different ways in which a nuclear war might start. Consider each of the following and indicate which one you think is the most likely to lead to nuclear war. Mark only one answer.

A. The Soviets will invade Europe or launch a surprise attack with nuclear weapons against the U.S.

B. A war in the Third World (for example, in the Middle East) will escalate and draw in the superpowers.

C. Terrorists or a mad man will use a nuclear weapon.

D. A nuclear weapon will be launched by accident."

# TABLE 57

## IF THE SOVIETS HAD INVENTED THE ATOMIC BOMB: HOW THEY WOULD HAVE USED IT

| If history had been changed and the Soviets had invented the A-bomb, what would they have done | Attack the U.S. | Intimidate the U.S. | Only to Defend | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % |
| Total | 22 | 50 | 15 | 13 |
| Male | 21 | 52 | 16 | 11 |
| Female | 22 | 47 | 15 | 15 |
| 18-29 | 17 | 44 | 23 | 16 |
| 30-39 | 22 | 54 | 13 | 11 |
| 40-49 | 32 | 41 | 14 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 53 | 14 | 12 |
| 65 and over | 13 | 64 | 12 | 12 |
| H.S. grad/less | 19 | 49 | 14 | 19 |
| Some college | 24 | 49 | 17 | 11 |
| College grad | 22 | 56 | 14 | 8 |
| Post grad | 22 | 51 | 19 | 8 |
| Democrat | 23 | 48 | 17 | 13 |
| Independent/other | 22 | 47 | 15 | 16 |
| Republican | 23 | 56 | 14 | 7 |
| Seattle | 20 | 50 | 21 | 10 |
| Baltimore | 23 | 46 | 17 | 14 |
| Chicago | 21 | 52 | 14 | 13 |
| San Antonio | 25 | 50 | 12 | 14 |
| Nashville | 22 | 51 | 14 | 14 |

"Imagine that history were changed and the Soviet Union, not the United States, invented the atomic bomb. Imagine that the Soviet Union used A-bombs on Japan to end the World War II, and that they were the only country in the wold with atomic (or nuclear) weapons from 1945 until about 1955. If history were different, what do you think would have happened?

A. Sometime between 1945 and 1955, the Soviets would have attacked the U.S. with atomic bombs between, thereby defeating their strongest enemy.

B. The Soviets would have tried to intimidate the U.S. by threatening to use atomic bombs, but they would never have actually exploded any; their goal is to take over the U.S., not to blow it up.

C. The Soviets would have used atomic weapons only to defend themselves and their allies.

# IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## Methodology

This study of public opinion was designed to explore Americans' desires about the future of U.S. relations with the Soviet Union, but in an unusual way: we wanted to assess people's considered, realistic preferences, and so we measured their views after they had time to consider the risks, costs and implications of trying to reach very different goals. We asked people to consider four visions of the future, or futures, each depicting a different view of what U.S.-Soviet relations might be in the year 2010. The futures were developed to represent credible and balanced alternatives that would allow us to explore people's preferences. The study was strictly nonpartisan; the futures were developed and reviewed by foreign policy experts from points of view all along the political spectrum. Our goal was to see what people's considered judgments would be after they had time to consider the pro and con arguments and weigh the implications of trying to make each future a reality.

### Public Summit 88

The study was part of a larger project that included a four week citizen education effort called Public Summit 88. Public Summit was cosponsored by local newspapers, television and radio stations in four cities: Baltimore, San Antonio, Nashville, and Seattle. It was designed to parallel the study by asking people in the four cities to consider the same four futures, and their pros and cons. The effort culminated with the return of more than 76,000 "ballots," brief questionnaires in which residents in the four cities answered some of the same questions used in the panel study.

The design of the study grew out of a 1984 report by the Public Agenda and the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University called Voter Options. A national survey of public opinion about the nuclear arms race and U.S.-Soviet relations found that Americans' views about these issues were often characterized by inconsistency, and such inconsistency was most pronounced when people thought about the long- and short-term. That is, people often favored immediate policies that would take the country in a direction opposite from what they said they wanted to go. To enable people to consider and reconcile these inconsistencies, we designed a study in which they were asked to simultaneously consider both the short- and long-term.

## The Need for a New Methodology: Limitations of Existing Methods

In order to ask people their preferences about alternative visions of U.S.-Soviet relations in the year 2010, we had to give respondents a great deal of information. First, people had to understand the possibilities (that is, the four futures), then they had to see the relationship between short-term policies and each of the the various long-term objectives. It would have been impossible to provide so much information with traditional survey methods and so a method had to be developed that would enable us to do so.

The two principle methods of public opinion research -- survey research and focus groups -- each have certain advantages. Like other qualitative methods, focus groups, structured group interviews led by an impartial professional moderator, permit textured, idiosyncratic responses. In contrast to survey research, which is necessarily based upon certain preconceptions about how respondents approach an issue, focus group research allows people to speak for themselves. Focus groups reveal the intensity with which views are held, and yield insights about why people hold certain views, the values that are applied when they consider an issue, and the assumptions on which opinions are based. Focus groups provide a way of gauging how views change when people consider new information or confront a new problem they are asked to solve. In sum, focus groups provide a multi-dimensional understanding of how people think and feel. They are an especially valuable method when trying to understand people's thinking about complex, value-laden issues such as U.S.-Soviet relations.

However, focus groups have certain weaknesses. Since the number of respondents in a group is limited (a dozen people attend a typical session), even several groups will not enable a researcher to make statistically reliable generalizations about the population as a whole. Although, in many cases, respondents are representative of their community, one cannot generalize with confidence from such a small sample. Strictly speaking, the results of focus groups, like other qualitative methods, yield only plausible and promising hypotheses that can be validated by quantitative methods.

The strengths and limits of survey research using a probability or random sample are the mirror image of focus groups. With a national probability sample, one can generalize about the whole country within a statistically predictable range of sampling error. Such research permits quantitative analysis, including percentage breakdowns and analysis of demographic subgroups. However, even the most sophisticated questionnaire may elicit an incomplete portrait of how people feel about an issue. Key words or phrases may trigger a response that is quite different from what a slightly different wording elicits. Even pretesting may not identify all such key words and phrases. Additionally, survey research is not good for probing value differences, or gauging the premises or assumptions on which people's thinking is based.

Survey research is useful with issues that people already know about. But since only a limited amount of information can be communicated during an interview, surveys can provide only limited insights into how people change their minds when they consider new information or arguments. Further, surveys can not reveal what happens when people have a chance to talk to others or to consider a new idea for at least a few minutes. Consequently, surveys are not very useful for measuring people's views about largely unfamiliar or very complex ideas.

## The Citizen Review Panels

In order to gauge public reactions to the four futures, the Public Agenda/Brown Center used an innovative variation of a panel study called Citizen Review Panels, a method developed by the Public Agenda and used in a study for the Ford Foundation. (See "The Public's Perspective on Social Welfare Reform" by Keith Melville and John Doble, The Public Agenda Foundation, January, 1988.) This method combines the strengths of focus groups and survey research, of both qualitative _and_ quantitative research.

The panels consist of a large, demographically representative sample, and so permit us to quantify results. And since the panels are structured to maximize discussion, they permit a detailed analysis of responses to complex or unfamiliar proposals. Also, the panels are long enough to enable us to introduce a good deal of new information.

A total of 963 people from five cities were interviewed for about three hours each. To enable those with day jobs to attend (and thus get a more representative sample), we held the sessions on weeknights, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. The panels were conducted in five cities: Baltimore (on Monday and Tuesday, January 4 and 5); Nashville (on Wednesday and Thursday, January 6 and 7); San Antonio (on Monday and Tuesday, January 11 and 12); Seattle (on Wednesday and Thursday, January 13 and 14); and Chicago (on Monday and Tuesday, January 18 and 19.)

Briefly, two sessions were conducted each night, involving about fifty people who represented a cross section of the community. We first announced that two nonprofit, nonpartisan research organizations wanted to learn people's views about four visions of the future of U.S.-Soviet relations. We emphasized that there were no "right" or "wrong" answers, that we took no position on the issues, that we were interested only in their opinions and knowing why they felt as they did.

Respondents filled out a pretest questionnaire, then saw a video presenting the four futures and pro and con arguments related to each. They then broke up into groups of about fifteen for a forty-five minute discussion led by a trained moderator.* Handouts describing the futures and listing key arguments for and against each were distributed to aid comprehension; the discussion consisted of a structured review of each future and the key arguments for and against. Next, respondents reconvened to watch the second half of the video, the policy implications of the four futures. Then they separated for a second discussion lasting about thirty minutes. Finally, respondents filled out a posttest in which many of the original, pretest items were repeated. Upon completing the second questionnaire, respondents received an incentive payment of $35.00.

* The Human Organization Science Institute at Villanova University was used to recruit and train the moderators who were members of the faculty at Villanova University and St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia. Training was carried out under the direction of Richard Smoke, John Immerwahr and John Doble.

## The Materials for the Panels

In order to use this method, we first had to decide on the futures to be tested. Developed by the Brown Center and the Public Agenda, the futures presented four different views of what U.S.-Soviet relations might be like in the year 2010. To insure that the range of policy options involved in the four futures was simultaneously politically relevant, balanced and engaging to the public, the Public Agenda and the Brown Center collaborated for more than two years, conducting research with both experts and the public, including:

1. Weekly seminars at Brown University and a series of workshops with experts at institutions such as:

    -- The American Enterprise Institute in Washington, D.C.;
    -- The National Defense University in Washington, D.C.;
    -- The International Institute for East-West Security Studies in New York;
    -- The International Institute for Strategic Studies in London;
    -- The Atlantic Institute in Paris;
    -- The Soviet Institute for U.S. and Canada Studies in Moscow;

2. Consultations with key staff of the Senate and House Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, the State Department, and members of the Reagan Administration;

3. Extensive conversations with the project's National Council, a bipartisan group of more than eighty prominent Americans representing a broad range of viewpoints and experience;

4. A series of workshops with community leaders in ten American cities;

5. A series of focus groups in which the futures were tested for perceived bias and understandability.

* See Part V. for copies of the handouts used in the panels: arguments for and against each future, and the policy implications related to each.

Once the futures were decided on, the Public Agenda/Brown Center designed two questionnaires. The first, a pretest administered at the start of the evening, was designed to assess respondents' "starting point" including their views about threats to national security, the Soviets, and a variety of different policies. The second questionnaire, a posttest administered at the end of the evening, after respondents had seen the videos and discussed the futures, repeated many of the pretest items so that we could measure change. The posttest also asked about the arguments for and against each future and about the policy implications related to each. Though self-administered, the questionnaires were filled out while project staff circulated around the room to ensure that respondents did not confer or compare answers.

Before respondents could consider and discuss the four futures, they had to understand them thoroughly. Because of the amount of information to be presented and the clarity with which information could be conveyed, we used a videotape (made expressly for the project) to present the four futures. To increase comprehension, the video was divided into two presentations of about twelve minutes each. The first video presented the four futures rather thoroughly; the second reviewed the futures, then presented the short-term policies necessary to enact each future. The videos were written and produced by Jeffrey Tuchman, Public Agenda's Media Director, and Associate Producer Julie Lewis in close consulation with Richard Smoke of the Brown Center. Before their use in the panels, the videos were tested for bias and comprehension in several focus groups.

We also had to decide about the content and format of the discussion sessions. A primary concern was to make the sessions as similar as possible so that respondents working with one moderator in one city would have an experience similar to those who worked with another. A number of measures were taken to ensure comparability. Before the panels, the moderators were thoroughly briefed on the content of the project by Richard Smoke; John Immerwahr, John Doble and Richard Smoke worked with the group, instructing them how to present the material, handle the discussion, and respond to particular questions that might arise.

In the discussions, moderators worked within a structure that was carefully developed in advance. Moderators gave each respondent a summary sheet listing the pro and con arguments for each future, and the policy implications for each. Keyed to the video, these summaries were a memory aide for respondents, and also served as a script, enabling moderators to maintain a parallel structure in each of the discussion groups.

The discussions were administered so that the same amount of time was spent discussing each proposal. Moderators made sure that the most important arguments for and against each proposal (identified ahead of time) were aired in each session, either by one of the participants or by the moderators themselves. Finally, the groups were monitored for comparability by staff from the Public Agenda and the Brown Center and numerous sessions were tape-recorded.

## Reliability of the Results

A total of 963 adults were interviewed in the panels. As described below, while not a random group, the sample was broadly representative of the adult population in the five cities and, when aggregated, of the national population. Groups of between 178 and 208 adults were convened in five cities: Seattle, Baltimore, Chicago, Nashville, and San Antonio.

The sample is sufficiently large and representative to enable us to generalize about the views of the public as a whole. The sample, which consists of groups in five different regions of the country, is geographically diverse. The sites were also chosen for their diversity in terms of size, urban and rural representativeness and overall demographic composition.

We cannot, of course, specify the sampling error since statistical calculations depend, by definition, upon random sampling. Rather, the data should be understood as reliable but approximate indicators of how a random or probability sample would respond if the same questions were considered under the same circumstances. The sample is large enough to permit detailed analysis of key demographic subgroups. Further, the use of pre- and posttests allows us to measure changes in sentiment and in the intensity of opinion; it allows us to assess which arguments respondents felt were most persuasive and led them to revise their views. In combination with questionnaire results, comments from the discussion sessions allow us to understand why people felt as they did -- that is, to examine the rationale behind reactions to the four futures.

## Sample Composition

A quota sample of adult citizens in each of the five sites was drawn by the various interview centers in the five cities using pre-established quotas provided by the Public Agenda that included sex, race, age, income, education, and 1984 voting behavior. To be included in the sample, respondents had to be U.S. citizens and at least 18 years of age. Those who had attended a focus group within the preceding twelve months were ineligible. Recruiting methods varied somewhat among the five firms, but included shopping mall intercepts, telephone solicitation, and callbacks of those who had participated in earlier studies conducted more than six months prior to this study.

The sample is broadly representative of the population of the continental United States in terms of key demographic variables. (See the following pages for a comparison of demographic characteristics of the sample compared to the sample from several recent national surveys using national probability or random samples.)

Additionally, because many variables are related to the demographic characteristics used as strata in this sample, our procedure tended to increase overall representativeness on a variety of important characteristics. For example, the likelihood of someone being underemployed is related to sex, income and education, and the sample was stratified on these latter variables.

## Attitudinal and Demographic Comparability:

In addition to demographic comparability, we checked the sample's representativeness by comparing responses through the pretest use of selected items from recent national surveys. In the tables that follow the comparison of the panel's demographics to other recent national surveys, we compare selected panel results to data collected from studies conducted for the Americans Talk Security project by The Daniel Yankelovich Group (March, 1986), Market Opinion Research (January, 1988) and Martilla & Kiley (October, 1987), and to results from the Public Agenda/Brown Center Voter Options study of May, 1984.

Certain variations are due to the use of different kinds of interviews. For example, with telephone or in-person interviews, interviewers are usually instructed to coax respondents to make a choice, thereby minimizing "not sure" responses. That is, when the initial answer is "not sure," interviewers are usually instructed to say something like: "Well, if you had to decide, would you say you 'agree' or 'disagree?'" Since the panel questionnaires were self-administered, we often have a higher percentage of "not sure" responses. Perhaps even more important, the ATS surveys interviewed registered voters whereas the Public Agenda studies in both 1984 and 1988 interviewed eligible voters. In spite of these methodological differences, however, a examination of the panel's responses to results from a variety of national surveys, including ATS, shows substantial comparability.

# CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL
## WEIGHTED DEMOGRAPHICS COMPARED TO NATIONAL PROBABILITY SAMPLES

### RACE

| | White | Black/Hisp/Other Nonwhite |
|---|---|---|
| | % | % |
| PANEL SAMPLE | 82 | 18 |
| DYG, 1988 | 84 | 15 |
| MOR, 1988 | 85 | 15 |
| Martilla & Kiley, 1987 | 85 | 15 |
| Gallup, 1986 | 83 | 17 |
| PAF/BC, 1984 | 90 | 10 |
| Panel (unweighted) | 80 | 20 |

### TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

| | $15,000/less | $15-$25,000 | $25-50,000 | $50,000/more |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % |
| PANEL SAMPLE | 20 | 23 | 43 | 14 |
| *DYG, 1988 | 18 | 24 | 42 | 16 |
| MOR, 1988 | 19 | 25 | 43 | 13 |
| M & K, 1987 | 16 | 24 | 40 | 20 |
| Panel (unweighted) | 21 | 24 | 41 | 14 |
| | $15,000/less | $15-25,000 | $25-40,000 | $40,000/more |
| Gallup, 1986* | 32 | 23 | 25 | 21 |
| | $20,000/less | $20-30,000 | $30-40,000 | $40,000/more |
| PAF/BC, 1984* | 41 | 30 | 13 | 16 |

* Categories not directly comparable.

# CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL

## WEIGHTED DEMOGRAPHICS COMPARED TO NATIONAL PROBABILITY SAMPLES (cont)

### AGE

| | 18-29 | 30-49 | 50-64 | 65/+ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % |
| **PANEL SAMPLE** | 26 | 39 | 18 | 16 |
| DYG, 1988 | 22 | 39 | 21 | 18 |
| MOR, 1988 | 22 | 34 | 24 | 19 |
| Martilla & Kiley, 1987 | 26 | 40 | 19 | 15 |
| Gallup, 1986 | 22 | 39 | 19 | 19 |
| Panel (unweighted) | 28 | 38 | 18 | 16 |
| | 18-30 | 31-45 | 46-60 | 60/+ |
| PAF/BC, 1984* | 33 | 23 | 21 | 22 |

### EDUCATION

| | HS/less | Trade school/ Some college | Coll grad/more |
|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % |
| **PANEL SAMPLE** | 38 | 36 | 26 |
| DYG, 1988 | 47 | 25 | 29 |
| MOR, 1988 | 45 | 26 | 28 |
| Martilla & Kiley, 1987 | 45 | 26 | 29 |
| PAF/BC, 1984 | 50 | 21 | 29 |
| Panel (unweighted) | 40 | 34 | 26 |
| | Some coll/less | | Coll grad/more |
| Gallup, 1986* | 79 | | 20 |

* Categories not directly comparable.

## CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL

## WEIGHTED DEMOGRAPHICS COMPARED TO NATIONAL PROBABILITY SAMPLES (cont)

| | SEX | |
|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female |
| | % | % |
| **PANEL SAMPLE** | 49 | 51 |
| DYG, 1988 | 48 | 52 |
| MOR, 1988 | 47 | 53 |
| Martilla & Kiley, 1987 | 48 | 52 |
| Gallup, 1986 | 50 | 50 |
| Public Agenda/Brown Center, 1984 | 50 | 50 |
| Panel (unweighted) | 48 | 51 |

---

SOURCES:

-- Public Agenda Foundation/Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University "U.S.-Soviet Relations in the Year 2010: Americans Look to the Future," January, 1988. National study among those eligible to vote, N = 963

-- Daniel Yankelovich Group "A Series of Surveys of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," March, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N = 1,004.

-- Market Opinion Research "A Survey of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," January, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N= 1,000.

-- Martilla & Kiley "A Survey of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," October, 1987. National telephone survey among registered voters, N= 1,002.

-- The Public Agenda Foundation/Brown Center for Foreign Policy Development, Voter Options on Nuclear Arms Policy, 1984. National telephone survey among those eligible to vote, N= 505.

-- The Gallup Organization, "The Gallup Report No. 255, Political Party Affiliation," December, 1986. In-person survey, N= 1,864.

# TREND COMPARISON TABLES

| Agree with Statement | ATS#1<br>% | Pre<br>% | Post<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world | 38 | 38 | 42 |
| Because the Soviet Union will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms | 50* | 24 | 24 |

* October, 1987, before the summit in Washington, D.C.

| Agree with Statement | Pre<br>% | Post<br>% | ATS#2<br>% | ATS#3<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space | 55 | -- | 55 | 51 |
| While we spend billions to defend Japan and Europe, they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs | -- | 79 | -- | 84 |

## TREND COMPARISON TABLES, cont.

| Agree with Statement | Pre<br>% | Post<br>% | ATS#3<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| We will seriously damage our economy by sepnding too much money to defend other countries | -- | 74 | 86 |
| We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both | 50 | -- | 59 |

| Agree with Statement | Pre<br>% | Post<br>% | ATS#4<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| We should make our allies (Like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense, even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues[1] | -- | 78 | 80 |
| Most likely to lead to nuclear war:[2] | | | |
| Terrorist or madman uses nuclear weapon | 21 | -- | 35 |
| Soviet surprise strike on U.S. or invasion of Western Europe | 15 | -- | 10 |

[1] ATS#4 "...economic and political issues."
[2] ATS#4 "If nuclear weapons were ever used... "

## TREND COMPARISON TABLES, cont.

| Agree with Statement | VO '84<br>% | Pre<br>% | Post<br>% |
|---|---|---|---|
| If we had a bigger nuclear arsenal than the Soviets they would keep building until they caught up | 92 | 83 | -- |
| The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any | 82 | 68 | 71 |
| There is nothing on earth that could ever justify the all out use of nuclear weapons | 79 | 79 | -- |
| We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both | 67 | 50 | -- |
| The only language the Soviets understand is force and we have to prove to them that they can't push us around | 62 | 43 | -- |
| To guarantee America's security, we must have a nuclear arsenal equal to but not better than the Soviet Union's | 57 | 38 | -- |
| The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world | 56 | 38 | 42 |
| The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia | 53 | 37 | 41 |
| Because the Soviet Union will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms | 45 | 24 | 24 |
| When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism | 40 | 26 | 23 |
| The U.S. should always have more nuclear weapons than the Soviets | 39 | 33 | -- |
| The idea that all life on earth could be destroyed in a nuclear war is a wild exaggeration | 23 | 13 | -- |

**SOURCES:**

-- Martilla & Kiley "A Survey of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," ATS#1, October, 1987. National telephone survey among registered voters, N= 1,002.

-- Market Opinion Research "A Survey of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," ATS#2, January, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N= 1,000.

-- Daniel Yankelovich Group "A Series of Surveys of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," ATS#3, March, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N = 1,004.

-- Marttila & Kiley "A Series of Surveys of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," ATS#4, April, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N = 1,004.

-- The Public Agenda Foundation/Brown Center for Foreign Policy Development, Voter Options on Nuclear Arms Policy, 1984. National telephone survey among those eligible to vote, N= 505.

-- The Public Agenda Foundation/Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University "U.S.-Soviet Relations in the Year 2010: Americans Look to the Future," January, 1988. National study among those eligible to vote, N = 963

# PROJECT STAFF

Executive Committee:

The Hon. Douglas Dillon
The Hon. Amos A. Jordan
The Hon. William J. Hyland
Dr. Walter E. Massey
The Hon. David Mathews
The Hon. Charles McC. Mathias
Gen. Edward C. Meyer
Dr. Alvin M. Rivlin
Dr. Howard Swearer
The Hon. Cyrus Vance
The Hon. Thomas J. Watson, Jr.
Mr. Daniel Yankelovich

At the Public Agenda Foundation:

Research:
John Doble, Vice President
John Immerwahr, Research Fellow
Judith Kallick, Research Associate-
Cheryl Koopman, Research Fellow
Stephen Immerwahr, Research Associate

Public Summit '88 Campaign:
Kate Sheaffer, Campaign Director
Kim Edmonds, Media Director
Leslie Jaynes, Administrative Assistant
Rayne Pollock, Administrative Assistant
Jeff Allen, Administrative Assistant
Sonia Krotkov, Administrative Assistant

Videotapes for Public Summit '88:
Jeffrey Tuchman, Executive Producer
Julie Lewis, Associate Producer
Liza Zumwalt, Production Manager

Administration:
Herbert A. (Tony) Wagner, Project Director: The Public, the Soviets, and Nuclear Arms
Deborah Wadsworth, Executive Director
Jean Johnson, Director of Programs
Robert Kingston, Senior Advisor
Sarah Hamilton, Assistant to Director of Programs

# PROJECT STAFF

At the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University:

Administration:
Mark Garrison, Director
Jan Kalicki, Executive Director
Richard Smoke, Research Director

Research Staff:
Karl Berger
Kurt Campbell
Kenneth J, Coughlin
J.Terry Emerson
Dietrich Fischer
Elizabeth Hatch
Matthew Hirsch
Mark Lindeman
Sarah McClurg
Douglas Seay
Alan B. Sherr
Eric Stubbs

Administrative Staff:
Betty Garrison, Administrator
Phyllis Allsworth
Shelia Fournier
Linda Gomes
Barbra LeFort
John Lew
Michael Schrader

Others at Brown University:
Abbot Gleason, Research Associate (Professor of History)
Jo-Anne Hart, Research Associate (Asst. Professor of Political Science)
Eric Nordlinger, Research Associate, (Professor of Political Science)
P. Terrence Hopman, Research Associate (Professor of Political Science)

Research Assistants:
Antonio Anguita
Leslie Batchelor
Aaron Belkin
Lisa Flaxman
Diana Ganz
Ted Hirsch
Dwight Holton
Joan Maudlin
Jeffrey May
Jeanne McKenna
Alma Prins
Kristen Rodine
Graham Schwass
Michael Song
Robert Wheelersberg
Matthew Yeo

# PROJECT STAFF

City Coordinators for Public Summit '88

Paul Castillo, San Antonio City Coordinator
Harriet Hall, Nashville City Coordinator
John Hoyt, Seattle City Coordinator
Craig Livingstone, Baltimore City Coordinator

Public Summit 88 Media Cosponsors:

| | |
|---|---|
| Baltimore: | The Evening Sun, Times Mirror Co.<br>WJZ TV, ABC Affilate, Westinghouse Broadcasting |
| Nashville: | The Tennessean, Gannet Co.<br>SMV TV, NBC Affiliate, Gillette Broadcasing |
| San Antonio: | Express-News, The Express-News Corporation<br>KENS TV, KENS II, CBS Affiliate, Harte-Hanks Communications |
| Seattle: | Seattle Post-Intelligencer, The Hearst Corporation<br>KIRO TV, KIRO Radio, CBS Affiliate, KIRO, Inc |

Panel Moderators:

John Carvalho, Villanova University/HOSI
Joseph DesJardins, Villanova University/HOSI
John Doody, Villanova University/HOSI
John Fielder, Villanova University/HOSI
John McCall, St. Joseph's College/HOSI
Edward Sullivan, Villanova University/HOSI
John Immerwahr, the Public Agenda and Villanova University/HOSI
Judith Kallick, Cheryl Koopman and John Doble, the Public Agenda

Moderator Training:
The Human Organization Sciences Institute at Villanova University and
Richard Smoke, John Immerwahr and John Doble

Sampling and Recruiting:
A & H Interviewing, Baltimore, Maryland
Nashville Research Group, Nashville, Tennessee
L.T. Gibson and Associates, San Antonio, Texas
AIS, Bellevue, Washington
Illinois Center Market Research, Chicago, Illinois
under the direction of Judith Kallick

Data Processing:
CRC Information Systems, Inc., NYC.

# V. QUESTIONAIRES AND HANDOUTS

12/29/87

The Public Agenda Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, N.Y. 10016
(212) 686-6610

Questionnaire #1: Pretest

Center for Foreign Policy Developement
Brown University
P.O. Box 1948
Providence, R.I. 02912
(401) 863-3465

INTERVIEW # -- DO NOT FILL IN

1 -1 ___ -2 ___-3 ___-4

---

PLEASE BEGIN HERE

INSTRUCTIONS: Go though the questionnaire and answer each question. Circle the number of your answer.

What is your name? ______________________________
PRINT YOUR FULL NAME ON THE LINE ABOVE

1. Where do you live? (Circle the number across from your state)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. Washington | 5 | -1 |
| b. Maryland | | -2 |
| c. Illinois | | -3 |
| d. Texas | | -4 |
| e. Tennessee | | -5 |

People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

2. FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs.
Strongly favor.....................6 -1
Somewhat favor..................... -2
Somewhat oppose.................... -3
Strongly oppose.................... -4
Not sure........................... -5

3. FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat; Compete Otherwise: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the Third World.
Strongly favor.....................7 -1
Somewhat favor..................... -2
Somewhat oppose.................... -3
Strongly oppose.................... -4
Not sure........................... -5

4. FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world.
Strongly favor.....................8 -1
Somewhat favor..................... -2
Somewhat oppose.................... -3
Strongly oppose.................... -4
Not sure........................... -5

5. FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North America: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves.
Strongly favor.....................9 -1
Somewhat favor..................... -2
Somewhat oppose.................... -3
Strongly oppose.................... -4
Not sure........................... -5

Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

| | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called SDI or "Star Wars")...........10 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 7. We should provide aid to anticommunist groups and governments..11 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 8. We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries..12 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 9. We should bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments....................13 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 10. We should recognize and establish trade relations with Cuba.............14 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 11. We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically..................15 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |

| | | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights | 16 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 13. We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism | 17 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 14. We and the Soviets should work together on a joint, manned mission to the planet Mars | 18 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 15. We should make our allies (like Japan and West Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense | 19 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 16. We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war | 20 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 17. We should increase our nonnuclear, conventional military strength (army, navy, etc.) so that it matches the level of the Soviet Union | 21 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 18. We should stop defending countries around the world and defend only North America | 22 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |

Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is.

| Possible Threats | | Very Likely | Fairly Likely | Not that Likely | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19. The Soviet Union will attack other nations in the way they invaded Afghanistan | 23 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 20. Sooner or later, the Soviet Union will launch an all out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S | 24 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 21. The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war | 25 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 22. We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries | 26 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 23. We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position | 27 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 24. Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons | 28 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 25. A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into all-out war | 29 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |

| Possible Threats | | Very Likely | Fairly Likely | Not that Likely | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26. The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam | 30 | -1 | -2 | 3 | -4 |
| 27. Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world | 31 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 28. The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Libya and terrorist groups in the Middle East | 32 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 29. A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons | 33 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 30. Poor communications will cause a conflict or incident (like the downing of the Korean airliner) to become a crisis that threatens war | 34 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 31. We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race | 35 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 32. A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by a computer | 36 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |

Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union.

| Statement | | Agree | Disagree | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 33. The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world | 37 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 34. Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do | 38 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 35. No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal | 39 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 36. The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S | 40 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 37. While the leaders of the Soviet Union may be ruthless, they are not reckless or irrational fanatics | 41 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 38. The Soviets will cheat on any nuclear arms agreement they sign | 42 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 39. We will never be safe without a clear, decisive military edge over the Soviet Union | 43 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 40. We're so concerned about our military rival, the Soviet Union, that we are losing to our economic rivals such as Japan and Germany | 44 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 41. Working with the Soviets to solve common problems would be a serious mistake because they would take advantage of us and steal our high technology | 45 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 42. The new Soviet leaders are ready to "do business" with us just like the Chinese were in the 1970s | 46 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

43. Which of these statements comes closer to your own view?

STATEMENT A: If the Soviet Union became better off economically, they would use their increased wealth to stir up trouble by funding communist revolutionaries around the world.

OR

STATEMENT B: If the Soviet Union became better off economically, they would become less of a threat because they would have more to lose in conflict.

1. Statement A is closer to my view.......47 -1
2. Statement B is closer to my view....... -2
3. Not sure............................... -3

Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

| | | Agree | Disagree | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44. The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any............................... | 48 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 45. We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours; there's room in the world for both.................................. | 49 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 46. The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world................. | 50 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 47. The U.S. often blames the Soviet Union for troubles in other countries that are really caused by poverty, hunger, political corruption and repression........................................... | 51 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 48. Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms.......................... | 52 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 49. The only language the Soviets understand is force, and we have to prove to them that they can't push us around....................................... | 53 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 50. The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia.. | 54 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 51. When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism..... | 55 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 52. If we had a bigger nuclear arsenal than the Soviets, they would keep building until they caught up........................................... | 56 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 53. The idea that all life on earth could be destroyed in a nuclear war is a wild exaggeration.... | 57 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 54. To guarantee America's security, we must have a nuclear arsenal equal to but not better than the Soviet Union's...................................... | 58 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 55. The U.S. should always have more nuclear weapons than the Soviets............................. | 59 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 56. There is nothing on earth that could ever justify the all out use of nuclear weapons........... | 60 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

57. Experts feel that there are different ways in which a nuclear war might start. Consider each of the following and indicate which one you think is most likely to lead to nuclear war? Mark only one answer.

The Most Likely Way A
Nuclear War Will Start Is:
(MARK ONLY ONE ANSWER)

a. The Soviets will invade Europe or launch a surprise attack with nuclear weapons against the U.S.................61 -1
OR

b. A war in the Third World (for example, in the Middle East) will escalate and draw in the superpowers............. -2
OR

c. Terrorists or a mad man will use a nuclear weapon......... -3
OR

d. A nuclear weapon will be launched by accident............. -4

58. Imagine that history were changed and the Soviet Union, not the United States, invented the atomic bomb. Imagine that the Soviet Union used A-bombs on Japan to end the World War II, and that they were the only country in the world with atomic (or nuclear) weapons from 1945 until about 1955. If history were different, what do you think would have happened?

A. Sometime between 1945 and 1955, the Soviets would have attacked the U.S. with atomic bombs between, thereby defeating their strongest enemy.

OR

B. The Soviets would have tried to intimidate the U.S. by threatening to use atomic bombs, but they would never have actually exploded any; their goal is to take over the U.S., not blow it up.

OR

C. The Soviets would have used atomic weapons only to defend themselves and their allies.

(MARK ONLY ONE ANSWER)

A is probably what would have happened....62 -1
B is probably what would have happened..... -2
C is probably what would have happened..... -3
Not sure................................... -4

59. First, generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, and Independent, or something else? (If you are an Independent, do you consider yourself closer to being an Republican or a Democrat?)

Republican..........................63 -1
Democrat............................ -2
Independent-Democrat................ -3
Independent-Republican.............. -4
Completely Independent.............. -5
Other............................... -6
Not sure............................ -7
I'd rather not answer............... -8

60. When it comes to political issues, do you think of yourself as a liberal, a conservative, or a moderate?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Liberal | 64 | -1 |
| Liberal to Moderate | | -2 |
| Moderate | | -3 |
| Moderate to Conservative | | -4 |
| Conservative | | -5 |
| Not sure | | -6 |
| I'd rather not answer | | -7 |

61. What is your age?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Under 25 | 65 | -1 |
| 25 to 29 | | -2 |
| 30 to 39 | | -3 |
| 40 to 49 | | -4 |
| 50 to 64 | | -5 |
| 65 and over | | -6 |
| I'd rather not answer | | -7 |

62. Are you presently married, divorced, widowed, separated, or have you never been married?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Married | 66 | -1 |
| Divorced | | -2 |
| Widowed | | -3 |
| Separated | | -4 |
| Never been married | | -5 |
| I'd rather not answer | | -6 |

63. Do you have any children? Are any of them under 18 years of age?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes, my children are under 18 | 67 | -1 |
| Yes, my children are over 18 | | -2 |
| Yes, I have children who are over and under 18 | | -3 |
| No children | | -4 |
| I'd rather not answer | | -5 |

64. What was the last grade of school you completed?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Grade school or less | 68 | -1 |
| Some high school (9-11) | | -2 |
| High school grad | | -3 |
| Vocational/technical | | -4 |
| Some college/2 yr. college | | -5 |
| Four yr. college grad | | -6 |
| Post-graduate work | | -7 |
| I'd rather not answer | | -8 |

65. Are you currently employed and working full-time, employed and working part-time, unemployed, retired, or at home?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Employed full-time | 69 | -1 |
| Employed part-time | | -2 |
| Unemployed | | -3 |
| Retired | | -4 |
| At home | | -5 |
| Student | | -6 |
| Laid-off | | -7 |
| I'd rather not answer | | -8 |

66. Is you religious background Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else? (If not one of these, do you consider your religious background Christian or non-Christian?)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Protestant | 70 | -1 |
| Catholic | | -2 |
| Jewish | | -3 |
| Other Christian | | -4 |
| Other non-Christian | | -5 |
| None/I'd rather not answer | | -6 |

67. Are you white, black, Hispanic, Asian, or Oriental, or something else?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| White | 71 | -1 |
| Black | | -2 |
| Hispanic | | -3 |
| Asian/Oriental | | -4 |
| Other | | -5 |
| I'd rather not answer | | -6 |

68. For tabulation purposes only, please indicate which of the following income categories includes your total family income in 1987 before taxes.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Less than $15,000 | 72 | -1 |
| $15,000 to $24,999 | | -2 |
| $25,000 to $34,999 | | -3 |
| $35,000 to $49,999 | | -4 |
| $50,000 to $74,999 | | -5 |
| $75,000 or over | | -6 |
| I'd rather not answer | | -7 |

69. Please indicate your gender:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 73 | -1 |
| Female | | -2 |

THAT ENDS THE QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE KEEP IT UNTIL YOU'RE ASKED TO HAND IT IN.

Cols. 74 - 80 left blank

The Public Agenda Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, N.Y. 10016
(212) 686-6610
Questionnaire #2: Posttest

Center for Foreign Policy Development
Brown University
P.O. Box 1948
Providence, R.I. 02912
(401) 863-3465

INTERVIEW # -- DO NOT FILL IN

2 -1 ___ -2 ___ -3 ___ -4

---

PLEASE BEGIN HERE

INSTRUCTIONS: Go through the questionnaire and again answer each question. Many questions are the same as the ones you answered earlier. We're asking them again to see how, if at all, your views changed after seeing the films and discussing the issues. As before, just circle the number of your answer.

What is your name? ________________________________
PRINT YOUR FULL NAME ON THE LINE ABOVE

1. Where do you live? (Circle the number across from your state)

a. Washington........................5 -1
b. Maryland........................... -2
c. Illinois........................... -3
d. Texas.............................. -4
e. Tennessee.......................... -5

Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is.

| Possible Threats | | Very Likely | Fairly Likely | Not that Likely | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. The Soviet Union will attack other nations in the way they invaded Afghanistan................ | 6 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 3. Sooner or later, the Soviet Union will launch an all out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S......................................... | 7 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 4. The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war............... | 8 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 5. We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries.. | 9 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 6. We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position...... | 10 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 7. Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons.................................. | 11 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 8. A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into all-out war.................... | 12 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 9. The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam............ | 13 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 10. Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world.................. | 14 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 11. The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Libya and terrorist groups in the Middle East................................. | 15 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 12. A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons........................................... | 16 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 13. Poor communications will cause a conflict or incident (like the downing of the Korean airliner) to become a crisis that threatens war... | 17 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 14. We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race........................... | 18 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |
| 15. A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by a computer....................... | 19 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 |

Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union.

| Statement | Agree | Disagree | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16. The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world.....................................20 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 17. Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do................................21 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 18. No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal............22 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 19. The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S.............................................23 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

| | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20. We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called SDI or "Star Wars"), even if that means giving up the chance to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear arms with the Soviets......................24 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 21. We should aid anticommunist groups and governments in the Third World, even if that means sometimes supporting dictators and others who do not believe in democracy..........................25 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 22. We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries, even if the only way to gain their trust is by sharing or not building SDI or Star Wars......................26 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 23. We should bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments, even if that means our allies might make concessions to the Soviets............27 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 24. We should recognize Cuba and establish trade relations, even if that means strengthening and legitimizing a communist government in this hemisphere....................28 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 25. We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically, even if that means leaving them with the largest army in the world............29 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |

| | Strongly Favor | Somewhat Favor | Somewhat Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26. We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights, even if that means not signing any arms control agreement.....................30 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 27. We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism, even if that means increasing the chance that U.S. troops will get involved in local fighting............................31 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 28. We and the Soviets should work together on a joint manned mission to the planet Mars, even if that means sharing our high technology...........32 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 29. We should make our allies (like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues....................33 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 30. We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war, even if that means doing things that our allies such as Israel oppose......34 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 31. We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically, even if that means increasing our nonnuclear, conventional military strength (army, navy, etc.) so that it matches their's.............................35 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |
| 32. We should stop defending countries around the world and defend only North America even if that means we might eventually be surrounded by enemies...36 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -5 |

Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

| | Agree | Disagree | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| 33. The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any..............................37 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 34. We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both.................................38 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 35. The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world.................39 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 36. Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms..........................40 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 37. The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia..41 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 38. When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism.....42 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

39. How do you feel about the following? A major American auto company is considering a joint venture to make cars in the Soviet Union. Those in favor say this would help an American company compete with the Japanese in the world market. But those opposed say this kind of an arrangement would make the Soviets stronger and thus more of a threat in the long run. How do you feel? Do you favor or oppose an American company making cars in the Soviet Union to sell on the world market?

Favor......................43 -1
Oppose......................... -2
Not sure....................... -3

Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

| | A Convincing Argument | Not Convincing | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| PRO ARGUMENTS | | | |
| 40. We can gain the upper hand because we are wealthier than the Soviets and we have the edge in high technology...............................44 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 41. The success of the Grenada invasion proves that we can and should try to stop communist expansion........................................45 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 42. The U.S. has an obligation to oppose Soviet and communist expansion and defend freedom around the world..................................46 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 43. We are already in a winner-take-all competition with the Soviets and, realistically speaking, this is the only way to keep them at bay...............47 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| CON ARGUMENTS | | | |
| 44. Trying to gain military superiority is a formula for an endless arms race..................48 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 45. Trying to stop communist expansion around the world will only lead us into more Vietnams........49 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 46. This Future would be too expensive because it would mean enormous defense spending, year after year..........................................50 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 47. This Future would be too dangerous because the Soviets might feel like a cornered rat........51 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

48. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand. Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs.

PRO: History proves that strength is the only thing the Russians respect.
CON: Risky: will make the Soviets feel as if they are backed into a corner.

Strongly favor.....................52 -1
Somewhat favor......................... -2
Somewhat oppose........................ -3
Strongly oppose........................ -4
Not sure............................... -5

Here are some arguments for and against Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT; COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the Third World. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

| PRO ARGUMENTS | | A Convincing Argument | Not Convincing | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 49. We should drastically cut the number of nuclear weapons on both sides so that, if somehow they are ever used, the whole world won't be destroyed | 53 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 50. Under their new leader, the Soviets will allow on-site inspection and so we'll know if they cheat. | 54 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 51. We and the Soviets should reach agreements to prevent local conflicts, such as in the Middle East, from escalating because they are the major way that a nuclear war could start | 55 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 52. Eliminating the nuclear threat will enable us to oppose communist expansion in the Third World with less risk | 56 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| CON ARGUMENTS | | | | |
| 53. The Soviets can't be trusted and will cheat on arms control treaties | 57 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 54. We should not reach agreements to end the arms race because nuclear weapons have kept the peace since World War II | 58 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 55. This Future would leave the Soviets with a large advantage in nonnuclear (conventional) forces such as tanks and soldiers | 59 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 56. It's just not realistic to think that we can compete with the Soviets in the Third World while, at the same time, cooperate with them to eliminate the risk of nuclear war | 60 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

57. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat: Compete Otherwise. Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the Third World.

PRO: The way things are going now, it's only a matter of time before there is a nuclear war.
CON: The Soviets can't be trusted to keep such agreements.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor | 61 | -1 |
| Somewhat favor | | -2 |
| Somewhat oppose | | -3 |
| Strongly oppose | | -4 |
| Not sure | | -5 |

Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOVLING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

| | A Convincing Argument | Not Convincing | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| PRO ARGUMENTS | | | |
| 58. The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution, and AIDS are the real problems facing us and the Soviets....62 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 59. A basic change in the U.S.-Soviet relationship that improves trust is the only way we'll be able to end the arms race..............................63 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 60. The Soviets seem willing to go down this path..64 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 61. Unless we change our relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreements won't make us safe...65 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| CON ARGUMENTS | | | |
| 62. This Future would mean giving up the fight against communist expansion around the world and accepting a ruthless dictatorship as an equal partner..........66 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 63. This Future would require us sharing our high technology and giving up our main edge.............67 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 64. This Future would mean sharing or not building SDI, and giving up the idea of gaining clear military superiority...............................68 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 65. The Soviets will trick us, pretend to cooperate, then turn on us as they've done in the past........69 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

66. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving. Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world.

PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to build trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us.

| | |
|---|---|
| Strongly favor......................70 | -1 |
| Somewhat favor...................... | -2 |
| Somewhat oppose...................... | -3 |
| Strongly oppose...................... | -4 |
| Not sure............................ | -5 |

Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOVLING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

PRO ARGUMENTS

| | A Convincing Argument | Not Convincing | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| 58. The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution, and AIDS are the real problems facing us and the Soviets....62 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 59. A basic change in the U.S.-Soviet relationship that improves trust is the only way we'll be able to end the arms race..............................63 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 60. The Soviets seem willing to go down this path..64 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 61. Unless we change our relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreements won't make us safe...65 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

CON ARGUMENTS

| | A Convincing Argument | Not Convincing | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| 62. This Future would mean giving up the fight against communist expansion around the world and accepting a ruthless dictatorship as an equal partner..........66 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 63. This Future would require us sharing our high technology and giving up our main edge............67 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 64. This Future would mean sharing or not building SDI, and giving up the idea of gaining clear military superiority..............................68 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 65. The Soviets will trick us, pretend to cooperate, then turn on us as they've done in the past........69 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

66. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving. Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world.

PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to build trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us.

Strongly favor.......................70 -1
Somewhat favor....................... -2
Somewhat oppose...................... -3
Strongly oppose...................... -4
Not sure............................. -5

Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

| | | A Convincing Argument | Not Convincing | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PRO ARGUMENTS** | | | | |
| 67. Our allies are perfectly capable of defending themselves and they can afford it.................. | 71 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 68. Especially in view of our problems here in the U.S., we can't afford to defend so many nations.... | 72 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 69. Being the "world's policeman" increases our chances of getting dragged into a nuclear war...... | 73 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 70. While we spend billions to defend Japan and Europe, they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs................................ | 74 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| **CON ARGUMENTS** | | | | |
| 71. Our allies may make concessions to the Soviets and eventually leave us alone in a world filled with enemies............................................ | 75 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 72. We have a moral obligation to defend freedom around the world.................................. | 76 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 73. History shows that it is U.S. strength that keeps ruthless, aggressive countries from starting trouble around the world........................... | 77 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| 74. If we pull back, many nations would feel more insecure and would build their own nuclear weapons............................................ | 78 | -1 | -2 | -3 |

75. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North America. Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves.

PRO: We will be able to concentrate on our own problems here in the U.S.
CON: If we pull back, we will have to stand alone in a hostile world.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Strongly favor...................... | 79 | -1 |
| Somewhat favor...................... | | -2 |
| Somewhat oppose..................... | | -3 |
| Strongly oppose..................... | | -4 |
| Not sure............................ | | -5 |

Col. 80 left blank
End of Card One

Rank the four Futures in the order you favor them. Rank them by giving a "1" to the Future you favor most, a "2" to your second choice, a "3" to your third choice, and a "4" to the Future you favor least.

1 to 4 Ranking

76. FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand.......................5 ____
77. FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat: Compete Otherwise.....6 ____
78. FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving.......................7 ____
79. FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North America..........................8 ____

Is there any Future that you favor but did not select because you think it's not possible to achieve?

80. I like FUTURE ONE but think it's not possible...........9 -1
81. I like FUTURE TWO but think it's not possible...........10 -1
82. I like FUTURE THREE but think it's not possible.........11 -1
83. I like FUTURE FOUR but think it's not possible..........12 -1
84. I did not oppose any Future because it's not possible...13 -1

85. Regardless of which Future you prefer, which one do you think is most likely to occur by the year 2010.

FUTURE ONE is most likely..............14 -1
FUTURE TWO is most likely............... -2
FUTURE THREE is most likely............. -3
FUTURE FOUR is most likely.............. -4
Not sure................................ -5

86. How would you compare the presentation of the information tonight to what you normally get through TV news and in the newspaper. Would you say the presentation tonight was more thought-provoking, less thought-provoking, or about the same?

More thought-provoking than TV and newspaper...............15 -1
Less thought-provoking than TV and newspaper................ -2
About the same.............................................. -3
Not sure.................................................... -4

87. How would you compare the presentation tonight to what you normally get through TV news and in the newspaper. Would you say the presentation tonight was more understandable, less understandable, or about the same?

More understandable than TV and newspaper..................16 -1
Less understandable than TV and newspaper.................. -2
About the same.............................................. -3
Not sure.................................................... -4

88. Did you change your mind about any aspects of this issue or think about the issue in ways that you had not previously considered?

Yes..................................17 -1 -- Please elaborate below
No................................... -2
Not sure............................. -3

89. What did you change your mind about or think about differently? ____________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________ 18-19

90. Have you heard of Public Summit 88?
Yes...............................20 -1 -- Please elaborate below
No................................ -2
Not sure.......................... -3

91. What have you heard? ______________________________

______________________________

______________________________21-22

These last few questions are only for tabulation purposes and are strictly confidential.

92. First, generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else? (If you are an Independent, do you consider yourself closer to being a Republican or a Democrat?)

Republican.........................23 -1
Democrat............................ -2
Independent-Democrat................ -3
Independent-Republican.............. -4
Completely Independent.............. -5
Other............................... -6
Not sure............................ -7
I'd rather not answer............... -8

93. When it comes to political issues, do you think of yourself as a liberal, a conservative, or a moderate?

Liberal............................24 -1
Moderate to Liberal................. -2
Moderate............................ -3
Moderate to Conservative............ -4
Conservative........................ -5
Not sure............................ -6
I'd rather not answer............... -7

94. What is your age?

Under 25...........................25 -1
25 to 29............................ -2
30 to 39............................ -3
40 to 49............................ -4
50 to 64............................ -5
65 and over......................... -6
I'd rather not answer............... -7

95. Are you presently married, divorced, widowed, separated, or have you never been married?

Married............................26 -1
Divorced............................ -2
Widowed............................. -3
Separated........................... -4
Never been married.................. -5
I'd rather not answer............... -6

96. Do you have any children? Are any of them under 18 years of age?

Yes, my children are under 18.....................27 -1
Yes, my children are over 18....................... -2
Yes, I have children who are over and under 18..... -3
No children........................................ -4
I'd rather not answer.............................. -5

97. What was the last grade of school you completed?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Grade school or less................ | 28 | -1 |
| Some high school (9-11)............. | | -2 |
| High school graduate................ | | -3 |
| Vocational/technical................ | | -4 |
| Some college/2 yr. college.......... | | -5 |
| Four yr. college graduate........... | | -6 |
| Post-graduate work.................. | | -7 |
| I'd rather not answer............... | | -8 |

98. Are you currently employed and working full-time, employed and working part-time, unemployed, retired, or at home?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Employed full-time.................. | 29 | -1 |
| Employed part-time.................. | | -2 |
| Unemployed.......................... | | -3 |
| Retired............................. | | -4 |
| At home............................. | | -5 |
| Student............................. | | -6 |
| Laid-off............................ | | -7 |
| I'd rather not answer............... | | -8 |

99. Is you religious background Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else? (If not one of these, do you consider your religious background Christian or non-Christian?)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Protestant.......................... | 30 | -1 |
| Catholic............................ | | -2 |
| Jewish.............................. | | -3 |
| Other Christian..................... | | -4 |
| Other non-Christian................. | | -5 |
| None/I'd rather not answer.......... | | -6 |

100. Are you white, black, Hispanic, Asian, Oriental, or something else?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| White............................... | 31 | -1 |
| Black............................... | | -2 |
| Hispanic............................ | | -3 |
| Asian/Oriental...................... | | -4 |
| Other............................... | | -5 |
| I'd rather not answer............... | | -6 |

101. For tabulation purposes only, please indicate which of the following income categories includes your total family income in 1987 before taxes.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Less than $15,000................... | 32 | -1 |
| $15,000 to $24,999.................. | | -2 |
| $25,000 to $34,999.................. | | -3 |
| $35,000 to $49,999.................. | | -4 |
| $50,000 to $74,999.................. | | -5 |
| $75,000 or over..................... | | -6 |
| I'd rather not answer............... | | -7 |

102. Please indicate your gender:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Male................................ | 33 | -1 |
| Female.............................. | | -2 |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. THAT COMPLETES THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
PLEASE KEEP IT UNITL YOU ARE ASKED TO HAND IT IN.

Cols. 34 - 80 left blank
End of Second Card

## Future One: America Gains the Upper Hand

By 2010 the U.S. will have achieved military and political superiority over the Soviet Union. We will have realized that the Soviets, no matter what they pretend, aim to dominate the world. So we will have developed advanced nuclear and other weapons, probably including a "Star Wars" defense against missiles. And we will be vigorously opposing Marxism in the Third World.

**Arguments FOR this future:**

-- Possible because we are wealthier and have an edge in high technology.

-- Grenada proves that we can stop communist expansion.

-- We have an obligation to oppose Soviet/communist expansion and defend freedom.

-- We are already in a winner-take-all competition and, realistically, this is the only way to keep the Soviets at bay.

**Arguments AGAINST this future:**

-- A formula for an endless arms race.

-- Trying to stop communism will lead to more Vietnams.

-- Too expensive, would mean enormous defense spending, year after year.

-- Too dangerous, the Soviets might feel like a cornered rat.

**The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:**

The greatest danger we face is Soviet aggression.

## Future Two: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat; Compete Otherwise

By 2010 we and the Soviets will have taken far-reaching steps to make sure a global holocaust is impossible. Nearly all nuclear weapons will be scrapped, with strict safeguards against Soviet cheating. And the two sides will have taken steps to prevent any crisis (for instance in the Middle East) from escalating into a global war. But despite the agreement on nuclear arms, both sides continue to compete for world influence, and both seek to gain supporters in the Third World.

Arguments FOR this future:

-- If nuclear weapons are ever used, at least the world won't be destroyed.
-- The Soviets now allow on-site inspection and so we'll know if they cheat.
-- Local conflicts that escalate are how a nuclear war could start.
-- We'll be able to strongly oppose communist expansion with less risk.

Arguments AGAINST this future:

-- The Soviets will cheat on arms control treaties.
-- The fear of nuclear weapons has kept the peace since World War II.
-- The Soviets will have more nonnuclear or conventional forces (tanks and soldiers).
-- It's not realistic to think we can compete with the Soviets in the Third World while cooperating with them on nuclear arms.

The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:

The greatest danger we face is global nuclear war.

## Future Three: Cooperative Problem-Solving

By 2010 the U.S. and the Soviet Union will have changed their whole relationship, much as the U.S. and China did in the 1970s. The two sides are now cooperating on problems that face them both, such as terrorism, the spread of nuclear weapons, and dangers to the environment. The two sides have built up trust, which allows them to work now on the tougher problem of nuclear weapons. Building up trust has not been done on U.S. terms; both sides have made compromises.

**Arguments FOR this future:**

-- The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution, and AIDS are the real problems facing us and the Soviets.

-- Improving trust is the only way to end the arms race.

-- They seem willing to go down this path.

-- Unless we change the relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreements won't make us safe.

**Arguments AGAINST this future:**

-- Would mean ending the fight against communist expansion and accepting a dictatorship as our partner.

-- Would require sharing our high technology and giving up our main edge.

-- Would mean sharing or not building SDI, and never gaining clear military superiority.

-- The Soviets will pretend to cooperate, then turn on us.

**The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:**

The greatest danger we face is the hostility between the two sides.

## Future Four: Defend Only North America

By 2010 we will have recognized that the main challenge we face is not the Soviets but problems here at home. We will have phased out our alliances in Europe and Asia, and brought home our troops. Now the U.S. maintains a strong defense of North America, probably including a ("Star Wars") defense against missiles. Otherwise we are concentrating on our own affairs. What the Soviets do or don't do is not a major concern.

**Arguments FOR this future:**

-- Our allies are capable of defending themselves.
-- We can't afford to defend so many nations.
-- Being the "world's policeman" increases the chances of nuclear war.
-- We spend billions to defend Japan and Europe while they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs.

**Arguments AGAINST this future:**

-- Our allies may make concessions to the Soviets and leave us alone in a world filled with enemies.
-- We have a moral obligation to defend freedom around the world.
-- History shows that our strength keeps other countries from starting trouble.
-- Other nations will feel the need to build their own nuclear weapons.

**The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:**

The greatest danger we face is being involved in other people's affairs all around the world.

## Policies for the next few years

### FUTURE 1

- Build up nuclear and non-nuclear weapons, to a level superior to the Soviets.
- Rapidly develop, and begin to deploy, SDI ("Star Wars")
- Strongly aid freedom fighters combatting Communism in the Third World. (Examples: Nicaragua, Africa, Afghanistan, Grenada)

### FUTURE 2

- Negotiate drastic cuts in nuclear weapons, working in stages toward removing them almost entirely. Agreements must include strict verification
- Negotiate agreements to prevent escalation of regional crises into global war.
- Support anti-Communist freedom fighters in the Third World ONLY where there is no risk of a crisis with the Soviets. (Examples: Afghanistan, Grenada)

### FUTURE 3

- Begin working with the Soviets on common problems: AIDS, terrorism, the spread of nuclear weapons, pollution and other environmental dangers.
- As greater trust is built up this way, use that trust to attack the tougher problem of nuclear weapons.
- Treat Communist Third World nations pragmatically, not ideologically. (Example: open trade with Cuba.)

### FUTURE 4

- Tell the West Europeans, Japanese and other allies that we will phase out our alliances on a set schedule.
- Begin to bring our troops home from abroad. All of them will be home in, say, ten years.
- Rapidly develop, and begin to deploy, SDI ("Star Wars") if it proves effective.

## NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

Dr. Harold M. Agnew
Former Chief Executive Officer, GA Technologies
Member, White House Science Council

Professor Madeleine Albright
School of Foreign Service
Georgetown University

Dr. Lew Allen, Jr.
Director, Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology

Professor Graham T. Allison
Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

Vice Admiral John A. Baldwin
President, Naval War College

His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
Archbishop of Chicago

Professor Seweryn Bialer
Director, Research Institute on International Change
Columbia University

Dr. Ernest Boyer
Former U.S. Commissioner of Education
President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Mr. Lawrence E. Bruce, Jr.
President, U.S. Committee for UNICEF

Professor McGeorge Bundy
Former Special Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
Department of History, New York University

Mr. Willard C. Butcher
Chairman, The Chase Manhattan Bank

National Council

Mr. Louis W. Cabot
Chairman, Cabot Corporation

Mr. Philip Caldwell
Senior Managing Director, Shearson Lehman Brothers

Ms. Antonia Handler Chayes
Former Under Secretary of the Air Force
Chairman, Endispute

The Honorable Warren Christopher
Former Deputy Secretary of State
O'Melveny and Myers

The Honorable Henry Cisneros
Mayor of San Antonio

The Honorable Harlan Cleveland
Former U.S. Ambassador to NATO
Dean, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota

The Honorable Clark M. Clifford
Former Secretary of Defense
Clifford and Warnke

The Honorable William Colby
Former Director of Central Intelligence
Colby, Bailey, and Associates

The Honorable Martha Layne Collins
Governor of the State of Kentucky

Mr. Edward H. Crane
President, Cato Institute

Ms. Mary Dent Crisp
Former Co-Chair, Republican National Committee
Senior Advisor, Business Executives for National Security

Dr. Lynn E. Davis
Former Deputy to the Under Secretary of Defense
Director of Studies, International Institute
for Strategic Studies

National Council

Mr. William M. Detweiler
Chairman, Foreign Relations Commission
The American Legion

*The Honorable Douglas Dillon
Former Secretary of the Treasury
Brunt & Company

Ms. Mary Anne Dolan
Journalist
The Los Angeles Herald-Examiner

Professor Paul Doty
Center for Science and International Affairs
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

Father Robert F. Drinan
Former Member of Congress
Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center

The Honorable Lawrence S. Eagleburger
Former Under Secretary of State
President, Kissinger Associates

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
Former Mayor of San Francisco

Ms. Randall Forsberg
Executive Director, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies

The Honorable Henry H. Fowler
Former Secretary of the Treasury

Dr. Marvin Goldberger
Director, Institute for Advanced Study

The Honorable Arthur A. Hartman
Former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Andrew Heiskell
Former Chairman of the Board, TIME Incorporated

The Honorable Richard Helms
Former Director, Central Intelligence Agency
President, Safeer Company

## National Council

The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh
President Emeritus, University of Notre Dame

Mr. Arnold L. Horelick
Director, RAND/UCLA Program in Soviet International Behavior
RAND Corporation

Dr. Matina Horner
President, Radcliffe College

The Honorable William H. Hudnut, III
Mayor of Indianapolis

Professor Samuel P. Huntington
Director, Center for International Affairs
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

*The Honorable William J. Hyland
Former Deputy Special Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
Editor, Foreign Affairs

Admiral B. R. Inman
Former Director, National Security Agency

General David C. Jones
Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

*The Honorable Amos A. Jordan
Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
President and Chief Executive Officer
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Professor Barbara Jordan
Former Member of Congress
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin

The Honorable George F. Kennan
Former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.
The Institute for Advanced Study

The Honorable Juanita Kreps
Former Secretary of Commerce
Professor of Economics, Duke University

## National Council

Admiral Gene R. La Rocque
Director, Center for Defense Information

Lt. General Richard D. Lawrence, U.S. Army (ret.)
Former President, National Defense University
Cambridge International

Ms. Flora Lewis
Foreign News Columnist
The New York Times

*Dr. Walter E. Massey
Vice President for Research
and for Argonne National Laboratory
The University of Chicago

*The Honorable David Mathews
Former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare
President, Charles F. Kettering Foundation

*The Honorable Charles McC. Mathias
Former Senator, State of Maryland
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue

The Honorable David E. McGiffert
Former Assistant Secretary of Defense
Covington & Burling

The Honorable Donald McHenry
Former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations
Georgetown University School of Foreign Service

The Honorable Robert S. McNamara
Former Secretary of Defense

*General Edward C. Meyer
Former Army Chief of Staff

The Honorable Patsy T. Mink
Former Member of Congress
Honolulu City Council

Ms. Nancy M. Neuman
Chair, League of Women Voters

## National Council

Professor Joseph S. Nye, Jr.
Former Deputy to the Under Secretary of State
Director, Center for Science and International Affairs
John F. Kennedy School of Government

Professor Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr.
President, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis

Dr. Sally K. Ride
National Aeronautics and Space Administration

*Dr. Alice M. Rivlin
Director, Economic Studies Program
The Brookings Institution

The Honorable George Romney
Former Governor of the State of Michigan

Professor Eugene V. Rostow
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law and Diplomacy
National Defense University

Mr. William M. Roth
President, Roth Properties

Mr. John Sawhill
Director, McKinsey & Company

Professor Robert Scalapino
Department of Political Science
University of California at Berkeley

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler
President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Dr. William Schneider
Resident Fellow, American Enterprise Institute
for Public Policy Research

Mr. Bernard L. Schwartz
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Loral Corporation

Mr. Albert Shanker
President, American Federation of Teachers

National Council

Dr. John R. Silber
President, Boston University

The Honorable William E. Simon
Former Secretary of the Treasury

Mr. Walter Slocombe
Former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
Caplin & Drysdale

The Honorable Gerard C. Smith
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
President, The Consultants International Group

Major General Perry M. Smith, U.S.A.F. (ret.)
Former Commandant, National War College

The Honorable Helmut Sonnenfeldt
Former Counselor to the Secretary of State
Guest Scholar, Foreign Policy Studies

Mr. Edson W. Spencer
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Honeywell

Mr. Kenneth A. Steadman
Director, National Security and Foreign Affairs
Veterans of Foreign Wars

*Dr. Howard R. Swearer (Chairman, Executive Committee)
President, Brown University

Mr. Robert Teeter
President, Market Opinion Research

Dr. Lewis Thomas
President Emeritus, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center

The Honorable Richard Thornburgh
Former Governor of the State of Pennsylvania

Major General Harold W. Todd
Commandant
Air War College
Air University

Professor Robert W. Tucker
School of Advanced International Studies
The Johns Hopkins University

Admiral Stansfield Turner
Former Director, Central Intelligence Agency

Professor Adam B. Ulam
Director, Russian Research Center
Harvard University

*The Honorable Cyrus R. Vance
Former Secretary of State and Deputy Secretary of Defense
Chairman, The Public Agenda Foundation
Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett

Dr. Frank E. Vandiver
President, Texas A&M University

General Wilma L. Vaught, U.S.A.F. (ret.)
Advisor, The Jane Addams Conference
on Security in the Nuclear Age

The Honorable Arlene Violet
Former Attorney General of the State of Rhode Island

Ms. Jane Wales
Director, The Security Options Project

The Honorable Paul C. Warnke
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Clifford and Warnke

*The Honorable Thomas J. Watson, Jr.
Former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.
Chairman Emeritus, IBM Corporation

Mr. Fred Wertheimer
President, Common Cause

Mr. Tom Wicker
Political Columnist
The New York Times

The Honorable R. James Woolsey
Former Under Secretary of the Navy
Shea & Gardner

National Council

*Mr. Daniel Yankelovich
President, The Public Agenda Foundation
Chairman, The Daniel Yankelovich Group, Inc.

The Honorable Coleman Young
Mayor of Detroit

*Executive Committee member

## THE PUBLIC, THE SOVIETS, AND NUCLEAR ARMS:
## PUBLIC SUMMIT '88

## PUBLICATIONS

The Public, The Soviets, and Nuclear Arms: An Information Kit (1987). Describes the multi-year joint effort of Public Agenda and Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development to explore and enhance the public's role in development of the country's long term policies for nuclear arms and U.S. Soviet relations. Includes information about Public Summit '88, a citizen information campaign conducted in cooperation with local television and newspapers in four cities in January 1988. Single copies available free of charge.

The Public, The Soviets, and Nuclear Arms: A Perspective from Community Leaders (1987). Report on a series of workshops held with community leaders in ten cities examining issues such as deterrence, the Strategic Defense Initiative, and the spread of Marxism in the Third World. Conducted as part of the joint project between Public Agenda and Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development. 62pp. Price: $10.00.

Voter Options on Nuclear Arms Policy: A Briefing Book for the 1984 Elections (1984). Part of the joint project between Public Agenda and Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development. Report based on a 1984 indepth study of Americans' views about nuclear arms, the Soviets, arms control, and communism in the Third World, and an analysis of opinion data on these issues since 1945. Outlines areas of consensus and confusion among Americans and contrast public opinion, elite views and existing policy options. 90pp. Price: $6.00. Technical Appendix: $10.00.

U.S.-Soviet Relations in the Year 2010: Americans Look to the Future (1988). Final report on a research study of nearly one thousand citizens on the future of U.S.-Soviet relations, conducted jointly by the Public Agenda Foundation and the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University. 120pp. Price $10.00. Technical Appendix: Forthcoming. Also available, summary ballot results from Public Summit '88, the joint citizen information campaign of Public Agenda and the Center for Foreign Policy Development, and conducted in cooperation with local television stations and newspapers in four cities across the country. Price: $5.50.

Public Agenda Foundation, 6 East 39th Street, New York, New York 10016  212 · 686 · 6610
Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University, Box 1948, Providence, Rhode Island 02912  401 · 863 · 3465